

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George J. Schoeneman to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, beginning at the top of page 6 of the Executive Calendar there are a substantial number of appointments in the Regular Army of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of the action of the Senate with respect to these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 16, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George J. Schoeneman to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Alvan Cullom Gillem, Jr.
Wade Hampton Haislip
Walton Harris Walker
Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg
George Edward Stratemeyer

To be brigadier generals

Joseph May Swing
Edward Hale Brooks
Wilton Burton Persons
Clements McMullen
Howard Arnold Craig

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, who art always more ready to give than to receive, and to hear when we pray, give us an immovable faith in Thee. So abide in our souls that we may conform to the

teachings of Jesus, with heart to befriend, with sincerity to shield, and with charity to be merciful to all. Hasten the day when men everywhere shall live, not by rivalry nor vanity, but in the ways of virtue and mutual fidelity. O spare us from that egotism that blinds us to our brother's rights and violates his property, his reputation and happiness. Each day help us to weave for ourselves, out of the great loom of life, characters that will stand the test of time and eternity; and unto Thee we ascribe all glory. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INCOME TAX REDUCTION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, if President Truman wants to keep his promise to cooperate with the Congress as he said he would at the beginning of this session, he will sign the tax bill which will give 48,000,000 income taxpayers a reduction of 30 percent in the lower bracket to 10 percent in the higher bracket from the present crushing wartime tax levies.

By such action he can cooperate with the members of his own party who cooperated with the Republicans in passing this tax bill by a 2-to-1 majority. By cooperating with the Congress he will be cooperating with the American people whose representatives are seeking to carry out their wishes. It is time that the President stop listening to his cheap political advisers and stop playing politics to the detriment of the entire Nation.

He can further cooperate with the Congress and the American people by approving the labor bill which through the cooperation of his own Democratic Members of Congress with the Republican Members expressed the will of the people by passing this legislation by a majority of over 3 to 1.

The President can hardly afford to set his judgment up contrary to the judgment of two-thirds of the Members of Congress and contrary to the will of the people in refusing them income-tax relief provided in this bill.

When the veto power was provided for in the Constitution the founders of our country never intended that a President should use his veto to thwart the will of the people. If the President vetoes either of these bills he will strike a serious blow against representative constitutional government in this country.

With foreign relations in their present disturbed conditions and with the tremendous debt hanging over this country and the financial relief the President continues to urge for foreign countries this is no time for the President or those who are giving him political advice for the future to encourage strife or the ani-

mosity of one group of citizens against the other or against the Congress of the United States.

There is work for 60,000,000 people in constant employment at the highest wage levels in the history of our country, to produce the things the people of our country and the world are pleading for. Our Nation and the world needs the wealth that can be produced in this country at the present time. Rather than to give out statements which are misleading and unfair with reference to the labor-management bill now before the President, which has encouraged the labor leaders of the Nation to unjustly inflame the minds of the rank and file of labor, those political advisers of the President will be doing him a service as well as all of the laboring men and all citizens of the United States if they will stop such inflammatory and false statements which, if continued, will encourage strikes and work stoppages dangerous to the laboring men's future and dangerous to the interest and future of all of the people of this Nation.

In passing the measures, the Congress has courageously put the interest of all of the American people first. The Congress has thrown politics out of the window in the consideration of this legislation. It is time the President follows the lead of Congress and keeps his pledge to cooperate with the Congress, the representatives of the people.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, there is what I consider a very serious statement made in the press this morning, as is shown by the headline of the Chicago Sun, which reads as follows: "Catholics rap union-curb bill." I do not at this time wish to pass judgment on the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which organization is responsible for the headline in question, because I have not yet had an opportunity to check the facts, other than those which appeared in the newspaper this morning. However, enough has been shown to cause me to comment that when the Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution the first amendment provided that Congress shall make no law with respect to the establishment of religion or prohibit the free exercise thereof. The same amendment also provides that Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech. Inasmuch as the restriction concerning religion has been placed upon Congress, it appears to me that there is a duty upon organized religion to keep from interfering in any way with the regular acts and duties of Congress, except insofar as the acts of Congress might affect the moral welfare of the people. While individuals in organized religious bodies are entitled to exercise freedom of speech as contemplated in the first amendment to the Constitution, certainly a body of leaders

of any organized sect should hesitate to criticize the deliberative actions of a legislative body, such as Congress, where it has sought to exercise its considered judgment in the passage of a law such as H. R. 3020, which was the subject of the remarks purportedly made yesterday by the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

I say in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that I am a part of a most distinguished body of citizens, persons who have already made their mark in all walks of life, and who are here in Washington working in the interests of all the people of the Nation; in fact, of the people of all the world. Before passing H. R. 3020, a committee of 25 Members of Congress, 15 Republicans and 10 Democrats, heard testimony every day for 6 weeks, a total of over 2,000,000 words, filling 5 volumes. Thereafter, one additional week was spent in the hearing of testimony in various sections of the country by special subcommittees; and 2 weeks in the drafting of the bill. Thereafter, several days were spent by the entire committee, which went over the bill line by line and paragraph by paragraph, and then 3 days were spent in debate in the House before final passage of the bill by that body. A similar mode of operation was adopted by the other body, and after the same deliberation a bill, S. 1126, was passed subsequent to the time of the passage of the bill in the House. Because of the differences between the two measures the matter was referred to conference, and after full and careful deliberation between the conferees of the two bodies a conference report was returned which encompassed the views of the conferees and resulted in the bill which passed both bodies last week, and which is now on the desk of the President awaiting his signature. Furthermore, when the bill was considered by the House it passed slightly better than 4 to 1, and by a vote of well over 3 to 1 in the other body. In other words, between 75 and 80 percent of the total of all the Members of Congress voted in favor of the measure in question, after the bill had been reported out by the committees and by an even larger percentage in favor thereof. I do not believe that any bill was ever given more careful consideration in the history of Congress. Therefore, I believe that the National Catholic Welfare Conference has made an unfortunate mistake, not only in endeavoring to criticize the measure at a time when it is awaiting the decision of our Chief Executive as to whether he will sign or veto the measure, but also in the type of criticism which appears to be leveled at the bill in question, and at the Members of Congress. The National Catholic Welfare Conference undoubtedly represents the view of the Roman Catholic Church which has always been a wise and provident institution. It is my considered opinion that the step taken by the conference at this time is both improvident and unwise, and that it has a political tinge which should have no place in religious circles, especially at a time which is so grave in the history of our Nation. I sincerely trust that the conference will see fit to investigate more fully into the matter and re-

consider the decision which it has made in the case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

THE MOVING-PICTURE INDUSTRY OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the 1-minute period, I was prevented from making a statement which I shall attempt to make today.

The California Members of Congress are proud of the over-all contribution of the movie industry of California to the war effort. This great industry rendered an incalculable service during the war. They made patriotic films by the hundreds, their actors and actresses traveled hundreds of thousands of miles to entertain our troops, many times under battle conditions, millions of dollars worth of bonds were sold in their theaters. The movie personnel from prop men to stars enlisted in the armed services and fought and died against tyranny and fascism.

The speeches of the gentleman from Mississippi and other Members of the Committee on Un-American Activities presenting a few isolated cases of immorality or communistic affiliation should be considered in their true proportion and should not be accepted as representative of this great industry and its loyal American personnel.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I requested time to speak to this House on the subject of insurance, not the ordinary life policy, but a type of insurance policy which this Congress is in a position to take out for the American people. As is the case with most insurance policies, the tendency of the person who is to insure or be insured is to delay, counting the pen-

nies which might be saved by hesitation. But when disaster strikes if there is no insurance the enormity of the loss which might have been averted is apparent too late. There begins the long and painful process of salvaging what can be salvaged from the foolish hesitation. It is then that the pennies saved become insignificant. And usually—we saw it happen only a few years ago—the process of rebuilding from the disaster is delayed by the incriminations and self-reproach that follow penny-saving short-sightedness.

The plan for the insurance to which I am referring is contained in a report with which I am sure all the Members are familiar. It lists specific recommendations for the establishment of a system of universal military training. In compiling the report the members of the Commission gave consideration to many of the same facts which this Congress considered in passing the Greek-Turkish Loan Act. There were other factors which make the adoption of the recommendations of paramount importance—those factors relating to the benefits which will come to the youth who participate in the program. At this time I urge the Members of this House to study seriously the recommendations with the view of enacting them into law as part of the general policy of insuring the integrity, sovereignty, safety, security, and progress of the United States of America.

At the outset, I should like to make it plain that I do not anticipate another war. I firmly believe that we have laid a solid foundation for lasting world peace through the offices of the United Nations. I do not believe that the adoption of an adequate defense program is inconsistent with carrying out our obligations to that body, with making it an effective agent for peace. By taking this stand on universal military training, I want to make it crystal clear that I am not advocating war as an instrument of our national policy. I repeat: I am advocating the taking out of insurance against contingencies such as those many of us doubted could happen in the 1930's.

Already, as part of the general program of insurance, this Congress has given much study to, and I trust it will adopt, the bill for the merger of the armed services. The resulting efficiency of our defense establishment, plus the savings which can and will be effected, make this legislation so essential that I do not believe reasonable men and women will differ as to its desirability. It is certainly a proper step, but it is not enough to provide the adequate defense insurance coverage which we need. I believe, however, that adequate coverage will be had when we pass a bill establishing universal military training.

Mr. Speaker, I have never until this time publicly injected my own personal situation into any controversy in which I have become involved. I do so now only to high light my reasons for advocating the adoption of this system of training, because I believe firmly that had we been adequately prepared at the beginning of the last war, the loss of life would not have been so great. I am also convinced that had we been pre-

pared, the happening of the last war could have been averted. Once the men and women of America understand that this is insurance, and not preparation for war, they will be willing to see their sons spend a year in the service of their country, for they will then realize that what is contemplated is the averting of carnage and bloodshed through training and strength.

I know from personal experience the grief and heartache a mother feels when her sons leave for military service. My three sons entered the Army in 1941 and 1942, and one did not return. They left at a time when we were still woefully unprepared for the responsibility which had been thrust upon us. I say to the parents of America today that it is far better to have their sons train now, and through that training form a reservoir of manpower, than to be called to service, unprepared, at a time when the very safety of the Nation is threatened.

It is to forget realities to say that human nature has changed so much within the past few years that a strong nation, bent upon aggression, respects anything less than equal or superior strength. It is true that the atomic bomb, now presumably solely in our control, is our best insurance at the present time; but it is also a fact that the experts, upon whom we must depend so much, predict that 4 or 5 years is the longest time that we can safely expect to have exclusive possession of this weapon. And when another nation does have it, what then? Particularly, I ask what then, if the nation obtaining it should be bent upon conquest and destruction? What nation is the most probable target? You know and I know the most probable target is the United States.

Perhaps you ask, In the event of such a war, of what avail are the best-trained troops? If an atomic war should engulf us, the most immediate result would be widespread confusion and fear and disorganization. We would then be thankful that out of such a holocaust we could gather together a group disciplined and prepared to assume the defense of our country. They would be ready because they had been trained for service under such conditions.

This is strong food for thought, but now is no time for those with queasy thought processes to deal with the self-evident facts of the twentieth century. It is by anticipation of events, however difficult they may be to consider at the time, that we safely insure for our personal and family protection. We must enlarge our conception of such insurance and apply it on a national scale.

Let us look for a moment at the cost of this insurance, for when we take out such a policy, certainly the cost has to enter into the calculations. The President's Advisory Committee estimates that it will be \$1,750,000,000 a year. Does that seem too high a price to pay? If it does strike you now as being too much, then I ask you to remember that it represents the sum that it cost us to wage but 1 week of total war but a few years ago. And when we are calculating the cost, it must be borne in mind that the cost of a conflict in the future, when reckoned in terms of initial outlay and in ultimate

destruction, will make paltry the sums so recently expended.

I have been discussing the obvious and most compelling considerations which point to the urgent necessity of beginning this program now. But, as with all insurance policies, there are incidental benefits which accrue to the insured. For instance, from the standpoint of physical improvement to the young men in training, the program recommends itself strongly. Not only will there be an organized and beneficial program of calisthenics, to build a strong corps, but there is available fine medical and dental care to correct defects and preserve what the training program has done for the men. In a Nation so advanced medically and scientifically, I was appalled by the statistics released showing that so many of our young and apparently able-bodied young men were unfit for military service by reason of physical defects. Certainly, many of the defects can be detected and the process of deterioration halted by the medical attention which they will receive while in uniform.

The educational feature of this program cannot be ignored, and must not be ignored when we are considering this training program. Not only will the young men receive the benefit of the smoothly functioning Army and Navy orientation program, designed to make them aware of the basic facts of national and international politics, but there will be gained the incalculable benefits of living and working together. It will tend to make the young men less provincial, in that, by working and living with others from all parts of the country, they will early learn the problems and factors influencing life in areas other than their own. Those of you who have served in the armed forces know this to be true; and I am sure that all of us have observed its truth by conversations with the young men and women so recently returned to civilian life.

When a background for understanding the problems of others, their own countrymen, is firmly established, then does it not follow that they will be better equipped to understand problems on an international scale? I suggest reflection on this point, and plead with you not to dismiss it lightly.

Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid that the adoption of this policy will lead us into the role of an aggressor nation; I am not afraid that it will be misinterpreted abroad. Any nation, anxious in good faith to cooperate with this Nation in achieving peace for the world, will be aware of our peaceful history and will not misunderstand. More important, any nation which does not act in good faith will not misunderstand that we intend to assume our burden in world affairs, that we will never again be a sitting target for their attacks.

I do not believe that we are forgetting the American democratic tradition when we enact a program of compulsory military training. It is a fundamental part of that tradition that a civilian fighting force be ever ready to defend this Nation. Formerly, there was enough time for training the civilian group before they were called to fight; but we saw how much that time has been short-

ened. Almost, in the recent war, we did not have the necessary time. All calculations at the present time indicate that there will be no time for training if, God forbid, an attack on our Nation should be made. We owe the duty, to the people whom we represent, to legislate wisely a program of defense within the framework of our traditions; it is not an illogical extension of that tradition to train before peril is upon us. I believe that it will save lives, and it might conceivably prevent a dispute between nations from turning into a general war.

We have it within our power to place such safeguards upon the program that it will not have some of the harmful effects predicted for it by the timorous. There will be the ever-watchful Congress of the United States to see that the program does not become something other than that which we intend. There will be liberty-loving civilian commissions to report at all times on the progress of the training. Besides these reports, the civilian commission shall be charged with the responsibility of preventing by means of publicity any attempt to indoctrinate the trainees with undue militaristic attitudes. Without these safeguards, the men and women who returned from military service only recently have not shown a militaristic attitude. On the contrary, they are serious and purposeful, full of the knowledge that we must preserve our democratic ideals. A small minority may have gone wrong, but the preponderant number are our best citizens, fighting for our ideals in civilian dress and they did while in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, on many grounds this program recommends itself for our serious and immediate consideration. Conditions are changing rapidly in this world, and safety has become a relative thing. Certainly, when we are unsure of the proper steps to take for protection, a broad and comprehensive insurance policy recommends itself strongly to our instincts of self-preservation. We can feel safe, though I have already said that safety is only relative, that we have acted within our traditions and our ideals. By educating mentally and physically the young men who will be affected by this program, we will be insuring for national safety and national progress. A nation strong and sound in mind and body is capable of producing a higher living standard for its people than one which is not; a nation strong and prepared can be alert, understanding, and progressive.

We have been charged with the responsibility of doing our utmost to keep America safe. With that responsibility ours, we can do no less than insure her safety. Every day without such insurance as we have it in our power to take out represents tragic delay. We have it in our power now to face realistically the future, and by facing it, we will have faced up to the responsibility which is ours.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I agree to a certain extent with my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] that the motion-picture industry has made a great contribution to the war. I do not agree, however, that the people of California or the delegation in this House can take any comfort or any satisfaction in the fact that there have been exposed in the motion-picture industry certain communistic influences. The isolationist attitude, about which reference was made, however small, is growing, is infectious, and we thank the Lord that it is not any bigger than it is. As a matter of fact, the head of the Motion Picture Producers Association, Mr. Eric Johnston, made the statement that he deprecates the fact that it exists, and I think it should be thoroughly investigated because there is no medium by which the population of this Nation is more influenced, outside of the educational system, than by the motion-picture industry, and it should be cleared of any communistic influence.

It must be said to the credit of Jack Warner, executive of Warner Bros., that he has said he wants communism removed from the film industry. Robert Taylor, Ginger Rogers, Edward Arnold, and many other film stars also favor cleaning the film industry of communistic influences. I think we should proceed to do this as quickly as possible.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD—MRS. ROOSEVELT NOT A CANDIDATE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], I desire to say that in my opinion the people of Los Angeles, Calif., who have petitioned the Congress to do something about the Communist infiltration of Hollywood know a great deal more about it than does the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The moving-picture men who came and testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities know more about it than he does.

Not only that, but they have no right to make pictures that poison the minds or corrupt the morals of the youth of this Nation.

That is what is going on. I told Eric Johnston so when he appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities here in Washington.

One expert in Hollywood said he could point out the Communist line in a vast number of the pictures now being shown.

I see that Mr. Henry Wallace says that the Committee on Un-American Activities is trying to cut down his audience when he speaks down here at the Water Gate. On yesterday there was sent to the Members of Congress a circular

headed "U. S. A. vs. U. S. S. R." It was enclosed in an envelope that has a stamp on it in large red letters, "My independent ticket. President Wallace, Vice President Mrs. Roosevelt."

I see Mrs. Roosevelt says she will not run for office on any ticket.

In that circular, in which they ask everyone to send contributions, they carry a special notice reading:

I will keep the type standing and await your answer. We should get out 100,000 and be ready for Wallace's revolution.

What is Wallace's revolution? Is that what all this drive is for? Is that what he meant by going down into Alabama and trying to stir up race trouble, where the two races are getting along so well?

If that is what they mean by the "Wallace revolution," then I submit that anyone will have the opportunity to go down to the Water Gate and get an earful of it.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

INFORMATIONAL SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BREHM) there were—ayes 36, noes 11.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 305, nays 28, answered "present" 2, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—305

Abernethy	Blackney	Case, N. J.
Albert	Blatnik	Chadwick
Allen, Calif.	Bloom	Chapman
Allen, La.	Boggs, Del.	Chelf
Almond	Bolton	Chenoweth
Andersen	Bonner	Chipfield
H. Carl	Bradley	Clason
Anderson, Calif.	Bramblett	Coffin
Andresen	Brooks	Colmer
August H.	Brophy	Cooper
Andrews, Ala.	Brown, Ga.	Corbett
Angell	Brown, Ohio	Cotton
Arendt	Bryson	Coudert
Arnold	Buchanan	Cox
Auchincloss	Buck	Crawford
Bakewell	Buckley	Crow
Barrett	Buffett	Cunningham
Bates, Ky.	Burke	Curtis
Bates, Mass.	Burleson	Dague
Battle	Byrne, N. Y.	Davis, Ga.
Beall	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Tenn.
Beckworth	Camp	Davis, Wis.
Bennett, Mich.	Canfield	Dawson, Utah
Bennett, Mo.	Carson	Deane

Delaney	Johnson, Tex.	Poage
Devitt	Jones, Ala.	Potts
Dirksen	Jones, N. C.	Poulson
Dolliver	Jonkman	Preston
Domeneaux	Judd	Price, Ill.
Dondero	Karsten, Mo.	Priest
Donohue	Kean	Rabin
Dorn	Kearns	Rains
Doughton	Keating	Ramey
Douglas	Keefe	Rayburn
Drewry	Kefauver	Reed, Ill.
Durham	Kerr	Reed, N. Y.
Eaton	Kersten, Wis.	Rees
Eberharter	Kilburn	Reeves
Elliott	Kilday	Richards
Ellsworth	King	Riehlman
Elston	Klein	Rivers
Engel, Mich.	Kunkel	Robertson
Engle, Calif.	Landis	Robson
Evins	Lanham	Rockwell
Feighan	Larcade	Rogers, Fla.
Fenton	Latham	Rogers, Mass.
Fernandez	Lea	Rohrbough
Fisher	LeCompte	Rooney
Fletcher	Lewis	Ross
Foot	Lodge	Russell
Forand	Love	Sabath
Fulton	Lucas	Sadlak
Gary	Lusk	Sadowski
Gathings	Lynch	St. George
Gavin	McConnell	Sanborn
Gillette	McCormack	Sasser
Gillie	McDonough	Schwabe, Mo.
Goff	McDowell	Scrivner
Goodwin	McGregor	Sheppard
Gordon	McMahon	Short
Gore	McMillan, S. C.	Sikes
Gorski	McMillen, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Graham	MacKinnon	Smith, Kans.
Grant, Ala.	Madden	Smith, Maine
Grant, Ind.	Mahon	Smith, Va.
Gregory	Maloney	Smith, Wis.
Gross	Manasco	Snyder
Gwinn, N. Y.	Mansfield	Spence
Gwynne, Iowa	Mont	Springer
Hagen	Marcantonio	Stefan
Hale	Meade, Ky.	Stevenson
Halleck	Meyer	Stigler
Hard	Michener	Stockman
Hardy	Miller, Calif.	Stratton
Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Conn.	Sundstrom
Harris	Miller, Md.	Talle
Harrison	Miller, Nebr.	Teague
Hart	Mills	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	Monroney	Thomas, Tex.
Havener	Morgan	Tollefson
Hays	Morris	Trimble
Hedrick	Morton	Vall
Heffernan	Muhlenberg	Van Zandt
Hendricks	Mundt	Vinson
Heseltun	Murdock	Vorys
Hill	Murray, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.	Walter
Hobbs	Nixon	Weichel
Hoeven	Norblad	Welch
Holifield	Norrell	West
Holmes	Norton	Wheeler
Hope	O'Brien	Whitten
Howell	O'Hara	Whittington
Huber	O'Konski	Wigglesworth
Jackson, Calif.	O'Toole	Williams
Jackson, Wash.	Pace	Wilson, Tex.
Jarman	Passman	Wolcott
Javits	Patterson	Wolverton
Jenkins, Ohio	Peden	Wood
Jennings	Peterson	Worley
Jensen	Phillips, Calif.	Youngblood
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Tenn.	Zimmerman
Johnson, Okla.	Pickett	

NAYS—28

Banta	Harness, Ind.	Rich
Bender	Jenison	Schwabe, Okla.
Brehm	Johnson, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Jones, Ohio	Taber
Clevenger	Knutson	Twyman
Cole, Mo.	McCowan	Vursell
D'Ewart	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Ellis	Mathews	Woodruff
Gearhart	Owens	
Griffiths	Rankin	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Hoffman Jones, Wash.

NOT VOTING—94

Allen, Ill.	Cannon	Courtney
Andrews, N. Y.	Carroll	Cravens
Barden	Case, S. Dak.	Crosser
Bell	Celler	Dawson, Ill.
Bishop	Clark	Dingell
Bland	Clements	Elaesser
Boggs, La.	Clippinger	Fallon
Boykin	Cole, Kans.	Fellows
Bulwinkle	Cole, N. Y.	Flannagan
Busbey	Combs	Fogarty
Butler	Cooley	Foiger

Fuller	Kirwan	Rayfiel
Gallagher	Lane	Redden
Gamble	LeFevre	Riley
Gifford	Lemke	Rizley
Gossett	Lesinski	Sarbacher
Granger	Lyle	Scoblick
Hall,	McGarvey	Scott, Hardie
Edwin Arthur	Macy	Scott,
Hall,	Mansfield, Tex.	Hugh D., Jr.
Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa	Seely-Brown
Hébert	Meade, Md.	Shafer
Herter	Morrow	Smathers
Hess	Mitchell	Smith, Ohio
Horan	Morrison	Somers
Hull	Nodar	Stanley
Jenkins, Pa.	Patman	Taylor
Johnson, Calif.	Pfeifer	Thomason
Kearney	Philbin	Tibbott
Kee	Ploeser	Towe
Kelley	Plumley	Winstead
Kennedy	Powell	
Keogh	Price, Fla.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Keogh.
 Mr. Macy with Mr. Dingell.
 Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Courtney.
 Mr. Towe with Mr. Craven.
 Mr. Bishop with Mr. Lane.
 Mr. Hess with Mr. Morrison.
 Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Price of Florida.
 Mr. Busbey with Mr. Rayfiel.
 Mr. Leonard W. Hall with Mr. Smathers.
 Mr. Kearney with Mr. Hébert.
 Mr. Lemke with Mr. Gossett.
 Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Barden.
 Mr. Morrow with Mr. Clements.
 Mr. Nodar with Mr. Riley.
 Mr. Gamble with Mr. Stanley.
 Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. Fallon.
 Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Meade of Maryland.
 Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Edwin A. Hall with Mr. Lesinski.
 Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Redden.
 Mr. Butler with Mr. Winstead.
 Mr. Shafer with Mr. Kelley.
 Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Crosser.
 Mr. Rizley with Mr. Fogarty.
 Mr. Herter with Mr. Clark.
 Mr. Horan with Mr. Lyle.
 Mr. Fellows with Mr. Cooley.
 Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Tibbott with Mr. Folger.
 Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Pfeifer.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Philbin.
 Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Kirwan.
 Mr. Fuller with Mr. Kennedy.
 Mr. Gifford with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
 Mr. LeFevre with Mr. Carroll.
 Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Combs.
 Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Flanagan.
 Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Granger.
 Mr. Hale with Mr. Boykin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3342, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Tuesday, June 10, there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] to the committee amendment on section 201, page 3, of the bill.

The Clerk will again report the amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana to the committee amendment: On page 3, line 14, after the period, strike out

the remainder of the line down to and including the period on line 21.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment in keeping with the amendment, which I now send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana to the committee amendment: On page 3, after the period in line 14, strike out the remainder of the line, all of lines 15 and 16 down to and including the word "when" in line 17 and insert "When"; and in line 18 strike out the word "reasonable."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not find the word "when" in line 18. I think the gentleman's amendment is not properly worded.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. It is in line 17.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read again because it does not fit in with the present bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana to the committee amendment: On page 3, after the period in line 14, strike out the remainder of the line, all of lines 15 and 16 and down to and including the word "when" in line 17 and insert "When"; and in line 18 strike out the word "reasonable."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] that the amendment be modified accordingly?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent to offer another amendment to the first part of section 201 and I ask that the two amendments be considered together, because they go to the same objective.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: On page 3, line 8, after the word "interchanges", insert the words "on a reciprocal basis."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes to discuss the amendments.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, when we had this bill before the committee last week, my objective was to make this interchange of students on a reciprocal basis. I have thought over the amendment which I have offered and I have decided that my amendment should be changed somewhat for clarity. Therefore, I ask that it be modified so as

to strike out only that part of the committee amendment which appears to make the interchange program discretionary rather than reciprocal. The second amendment which I have offered after the word "interchanges" in line 8 on page 3 places it upon a reciprocal basis. If you will consider the two amendments together, you will find that the interchange will be placed upon a reciprocal basis. Both amendments go to the same purpose and that is why I ask that they be considered together.

This last amendment provides that the State Department will make the interchange on a reciprocal basis. That removes the discretion. I think the House wants that. If you will note, my modified amendment, which I have just offered, struck out even the word "reasonable." The committee amendment placed it on a "reasonable basis of reciprocity" but I am striking out the word "reasonable," and I am striking out the language "It is the sense of the Congress that the interchange program under this section shall be on a reciprocal basis," and so forth. In other words, instead of making it an expression of legislative hope, I am making it a positive statutory requirement.

I am putting it on a reciprocal basis and then giving the Secretary of State the right to terminate the whole thing with reference to any nation when that nation fails to carry the program out on a reciprocal basis. I do not know how much clearer it could be made than that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I have now been supplied with a copy of the gentleman's modified amendment. I have listened to his explanation. As I understand his amendment it makes this reciprocal program a positive program, places it on an absolute reciprocal basis. That is in conformity with the thinking of the committee, it is in conformity with what every Member of Congress believes; it removes all elements of doubt; it is placed on a reciprocal basis.

The committee has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. I do not see how any Member can object and I hope both amendments pass. As I stated earlier in discussing this bill, I am not arguing for the interchange program at all, but if it remains in the bill, then by all means it should be reciprocal, and I am glad the chairman of the committee agrees with my views.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. May we have the amendment as now modified read?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana to the committee amendment:

On page 3, after the period in line 14, strike out the remainder of the line, all of lines 15

and 16 down to and including the word "when" in line 17, and insert "when"; and in line 18 strike out the word "reasonable."

On page 3, line 8, after the word "interchanges", insert the words "on a reciprocal basis."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN to the committee amendment: On page 4, line 3, after the word "deported", strike out the balance of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the Members will take the bill and read line 21, on page 3, they will find this language:

If the Secretary finds that any person from another country, while in the United States pursuant to this section, is engaged in activities of a political nature or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, the Secretary shall promptly report such finding to the Attorney General, and such person shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported in the same manner as provided for in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended.

The reason I have offered the amendment is that it has been demonstrated that when you try to deport a person under the sections referred to—19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917—you just cannot get him out of the country.

The committee has expressed its desire that people who come here under the terms of this bill and who engage in subversive activities should be fired out without any more fuss or feathers. So do I; and in my judgment that is the considered judgment of the Congress. So why not have the bill provide for that summary procedure by adopting this amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say to the gentleman that the committee originally had the amendment drawn that way. We consulted with Mr. Shaughnessy of the Immigration Bureau and with representatives of the office of the legislative counsel and they thought it might be more expeditious to put it this way. On investigation of the figures we find that 170,000 have been deported.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Harry Bridges is still here.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK] presented an amendment very similar to the one offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the committee. We met with him and told him we wanted this protected. So we agreed with him we would accept his amendment. The gentleman from Michigan has beaten him to the punch and we are willing to accept it, but we want the gentleman to

know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK] had presented the same matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not care who presents it, just so we get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sold on all of the provisions of this bill. In its enactment we are definitely establishing a policy of the Congress. Of course, this bill has the support of the President and the administration, and the real effect of this proposal is to implement the administration policy; that is, this bill would authorize by law the doing of the things enumerated. However, the accomplishments contemplated in the bill are impossible without the money to pay the expenses. It is, therefore, argued that Congress will at all times be master of the situation because of its control of the purse strings of the Nation. Of course, that is technically true. However, if the authorizations provided in this bill are given congressional sanction, it logically follows that the same Congress will appropriate the money to carry out the objectives of the policy which it has promulgated.

Mr. Chairman, this bill allows more discretion to the administrators than should be granted. I wish it were possible to spell out more in detail the limitations intended. Much of the opposition to the bill is based on the lack of confidence in the type and character of those who will represent our Government in presenting the Voice of America to the world. A thorough house cleaning in the State Department might make this bill more palatable to the Congress and to the country.

Usually I am pretty well decided as to what my action on a bill will be when it is called up for consideration. This is not true in the instant case. It has been very difficult to arrive at a definite conclusion. It is a question as to whether the possible benefits that might accrue under the law warrant the Congress in taking the chance and expending the money authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I am definitely in favor of interchange of students and teachers provided for in section 201 which we are now discussing. The reasons for this position have been well stated by members of the committee throughout the debate and I shall not repeat. The great University of Michigan in the city of Ann Arbor is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. I have received a number of telegrams from those connected with the university who are able to speak from experience and who urge me to support this section of the bill. These officials are well known to me and I have confidence in their judgment based upon their experience, and I want

to present their views to the House. These telegrams read as follows:

We strongly urge you to give complete and vigorous support to section 201 of Mundt bill authorizing exchange of students, teachers, and professors between United States and other countries. As director of the English language institute of the University of Michigan I have had intimate contact with some 1,200 such foreign students, teachers, and professors who have passed through our English and orientation course during the past 7 years since our founding in the spring of 1941. From my experience with these students, teachers, and professors I believe that this is the most important method of laying the foundations of the kind of international understanding upon which to build a permanent peace. Only by this program of living intimately with our own students and staff do foreign students, teachers, and professors obtain a vivid insight into our institutions and the real spirit which makes them work. There has never been the slightest hint of communistic teaching from any of these students, teachers, and professors throughout the past 7 years. I, myself, have been thoroughly convinced of not only the desirability of this program but its necessity for world peace that I have carried all the burdens of directing the work here without salary and in addition to my full teaching schedule.

CHAS. C. FIRES,

Director, English Language Institute.

Re section 201 of the Mundt bill being attacked because of danger that foreign professors and students teach communism in American schools. We have had hundreds of foreign students and many professors in the University of Michigan and we have had no instance of subversive activity among these students or professors. We also feel that an exchange of students and professors with foreign countries at the present time is one of the most important ways by which we can establish good feeling and mutual understanding between nations.

PETER OKKELBERG,

Assistant Dean, Graduate School.

We urge your active opposition to amendment offered to eliminate program of exchange of students, teachers, professors, Mundt bill, section 201. Exchange of students, teachers, professors highly desirable for future peace cementing relations on cultural basis. Our experience foreign students usually great anti-Communist factor on campus. Future leadership of other countries friendly to United States indispensable result. Students are on temporary visas so no letting down of immigration bars as charged by RANKIN, HOFFMAN, and others. Foreign students great force for export trade as they become accustomed to American goods while here.

ESSON M. GALE,

Counselor of Foreign Students.

M. ROBERT B. KLINGER,

Assistant Counselor, University of Michigan.

Ask you to support section 201 of Mundt bill foreign student exchanges one of the most effective means of gaining friends abroad for United States. Direct contact of foreign professors without intellectual hospitality and achievement results in admiration and greater understanding of American ideals and democratic institutions. Democracy must be effectively taught through intensified programs of cultural exchanges and strong support of our cultural centers and democratic principles abroad.

SARAH E. GROLLMAN,

Language Consultant, International Center, University of Michigan.

Have used exchange teacher from England this year. Most profitable experience for her and us. Much good will and understanding has resulted. Our teacher in England sends favorable report. We thoroughly favor the plan. Hope you support the principle of exchange as set forth in Mundt bill 3342.

OTTO W. HAISLEY,
Superintendent of Schools.

I am also in receipt of a telegram from the president of Michigan State College at Lansing, which reads as follows:

We have a considerable number of foreign students at Michigan State College, and think they add much to our educational program in making it possible for Michigan students to learn to know individuals, people of all races, and colors and creeds. In the small world in which we now live that is an important part of our educational program. It is my personal feeling that this Nation should encourage the maximum number of the right kind of young men and women from all over the world to come here for a portion of their education and then see to it that there is incorporated in the college training an opportunity for them to see the advantages made possible by our type of governmental, social, and economic organization. They can be an invaluable source of friendliness to this Nation after they return to their countries. We feel that the Mundt bill authorizing exchange of students is very desirable.

JOHN A. HANNAH,
President, Michigan State College.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore shall vote against the amendment to strike this interchange of persons provision from the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOOKS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including Government publications, for the translation of such writings, and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, unless this bill is drastically amended I shall not only vote to recommit it, but I shall vote against its passage.

Today we read of the rape, murder, and robbery, imprisonment, and slavery of innocent Christian people in Europe by the Communist criminal minority element in charge of those unfortunate countries. It seems to me not only ridiculous, but dangerous to bring into this country either students or instructors from behind that "iron curtain."

We had better get busy and get the ones out of here who are now plotting the overthrow of this Government. Every day we get letters protesting that certain institutions in America are poisoning the minds of children through these Red professors who are insidiously attacking our Government by spreading Red propaganda.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman knows, as was announced the other day, that not a single student from Communist

Russia has come here under this program, not a single professor, not a single student has been sent to Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, but communism is reaching out. While our representatives have been appeasing communism up in New York at the "Tower of Babel," Communists have been reaching out and taking control of the Christian countries of Europe where 98 percent of the people are opposed to them.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What kind of instructors, teachers, and professors does the gentleman think we would get from any country that Russia dominates or from Russia itself?

Mr. RANKIN. You would get a bunch of Communists who are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, who are dedicated to the destruction of Christianity throughout the world, who are dedicated to the destruction of our economic system, who would want to take over every particle of land and every home and every business and make every human being a slave of the state. That is what you would get.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I would like to ask the gentleman how many of the 377 students now in this country under this program are Communists.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know, but it would be interesting to call the roll and take a test.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman know who decides what constitutes other educational material? I want an answer to that. Who decides what constitutes other educational material? Can the gentleman from Minnesota answer that question?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question. My time is running short.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to advise the gentleman that not a single student or professor who has come here under this program has ever been charged by anybody with Communist domination, and the gentleman knows that, being, as he is, opposed to communism.

Mr. RANKIN. But this program is going to be as "broad * * * as the casing air," as Shakespeare says. I would not object to this Voice of America if you put men like General Marshall, Will Clayton, or other real Americans, that we know are Americans, to tell the people of Europe what America is like. But, if you are going to take some of these pinks or members of the Anti-Defamation League to try to tell Russia how much like communism we are, or ought to be, then I say you are wasting

the people's money and doing this country infinitely more harm than good. Now, if you curb this to where it will be the real Voice of America, I will not oppose it, provided you strike out the rest of the bill. But, I can tell you now I am not going to vote for anything that will invite from behind the iron curtain those influences that are today destroying the civilization of Europe and threatening the civilization of America.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. During the World's Fair in New York, when we had the Russian people trying to teach America what was going on over in Russia, at that time they were trying to fool the American people, and does the gentleman believe we can counteract that by inculcating them with our ideas by enacting this bill into law?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not, and I think that this bill is dangerous. I think it ought to be recommitted to the committee, and all those provisions eliminated except the one that provides for the Voice of America, and then that should be restricted so that we will know that it is the real Voice of America that is going over the radio.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this bill at this point. If it was a bill providing for the Voice of America, and it was honestly to be the Voice of America, I would support it. They have not yet cleaned up that situation in the State Department, which has cried aloud for attention ever since the whole thing started. Their very first broadcast to Russia was a totalitarian philosophy broadcast. I have had in my hands, and I have in my office, 500 broadcasts, and out of the whole 500 I defy any man to find one that would do America a bit of good, and he would find many that would do a lot of harm. The management of the thing has been bad. For a year and a half, Mr. Benton has been in charge of it, and he has not cleaned it up. There is still Haldore Hansen in charge of this cultural relations subject, the same fellow under whose management all those paintings and that sort of thing were bought. There is William T. Stone, and Charles A. Thompson, in charge of the broadcasts. Neither one of them should be on any pay roll of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Stone put out a circular on the 1st day of May after the Appropriations Committee had operated on this activity because it was not the Voice of America. I have it here, and shall insert it in the RECORD. It is a circular in clear violation of the antilobbying law. I wonder if we are going to have that sort of thing going on.

I also call your attention to the way they have done business. I have before me a comparison of the salaries that were paid a group of these people at the time they came from the OWI to the

State Department and the salaries that see the kind of business management are presently paid them, just so you can they have had. The list is as follows:

MARCH 17, 1947.

Following is a list of names reported by the Office of War Information as aliens employed by that agency in 1944, and which are found to be employed by the State Department, as shown by a list recently submitted by that Department:

	Names and OWI-State classifications and titles	Salaries reported paid in OWI	Salaries reported paid in State
CD, no; SD, no.....	Kurt J. Dosmer (German), assistant script editor, OWI, CAF-9; feature writer, Broadcasting Division, State, CAF-11.	\$3,200	\$5,403.60
CD, no; SD, no.....	Martin J. Fuchs (Austrian), assistant language editor, OWI, CAF-7; Chief, Austrian Radio Unit, State, CAF-13.	2,600	7,102.20
CD, no; SD, no.....	Vsevolod De S. Gebrosky (French), assistant announcer, OWI, CAF-7; radio script writer, State, CAF-11.	2,600	4,902.09
CD, no; SD, no.....	Gertrude Hesse (German), clerk-stenographer, OWI, CAF-2; State, CAF-4.	1,440	2,544.48
CD, no; SD, no.....	Karel Mazel (Czech), assistant announcer-translator, OWI, CAF-7; State, CAF-12.	2,600	5,905.20
CD, no; SD, no.....	Gerda Misch (German), assistant clerk-typist, OWI, CAF-3; State, CAF-5.	1,620	2,770.20
CD, no; SD, no.....	Zdenko C. Sajovic (Slovene), assistant language editor, OWI, CAF-7; State, CAF-9.	2,600	4,400.40
CD, no; SD, no.....	Paul M. Segnitz (French), announcer, OWI, CAF-11; State, CAF-11.	3,800	5,403.60
CD, no; SD, no.....	Mira M. Zeidner (Rumanian), senior translator, OWI, CAF-5; State, CAF-11.	2,000	4,902.00
CD, no; SD, no.....	Elizabeth A. Zweigenthal (Hungarian), junior script editor, OWI, CAF-5; State, CAF-9.	2,000	4,400.40
CD, no; SD, no.....	Beyne Vince Ho (Chinese), senior language editor, OWI, CAF-9; State, CAF-11.	3,200	5,152.80

Legend: CD, followed by "yes" or "no" means name is or is not in Congressional Directory, February 1946.

SD, followed by "yes" or "no" means name is or is not in State Department Telephone Directory, August 1946.

MARCH 17, 1947.

Following is a list of names which appeared on the list of persons employed by the Office of War Information in 1944 at above \$4,000 per annum and are also found to appear on a recently submitted list of employees in the Department of State:

	Names and present State Department titles	Entrance and top salaries in OWI	Present salaries in State
CD, yes; SD, yes.....	Eric C. Belquist, European Division Area.....	\$5,600	\$9,975.00
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Fred O. Bundy, Division of Occupied Areas.....	3,800	7,102.00
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Robert R. Burton, Broadcasting Division.....	4,600	7,581.00
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Nancy Chappalear, Office of Director, Policy Coordination.....	5,600	7,581.00
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Samuel R. Davenport.....	2,000	4,902.00
CD, no; SD, yes.....	John F. Deppenbrock, Division of International Exchange of Persons.....	2,600	7,341.60
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Thomas E. Goldstein, Division of Occupied Areas.....	4,600	6,144.60
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Ruth M. Hill, Director's Office, OIC Policy and Coordination.....	2,900	5,153.00
CD, yes; SD, yes.....	Victor M. Hunt, Director's Office, OIC Policy Coordinator.....	3,200	6,144.60
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Harry J. Krould, Office of Director, Policy Coordination.....	3,200	9,975.00
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Habib A. Kurani, Near East and Africa (ADN).....	4,600	8,478.75
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Kurt L. London, European Division (ADE).....	5,600	8,179.50
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Clara G. McMillan, Director's Office, OIC.....	4,600	6,862.80
CD, yes; SD, yes.....	Lawrence S. Morris, Division of Libraries and Institutes (Chief, Books, Materials and Service Branch).....	4,600	6,384.00
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Fred H. Trimmer, Broadcasting Division.....	5,600	8,179.50
CD, no; SD, yes.....	Isabel A. Ward, Far East (ADF).....	4,600	8,179.50
		2,300	5,905.20
		3,200	

Legend: CD, followed by "yes" or "no" means name is or is not in Congressional Directory, February 1947.

SD, followed by "yes" or "no" means name is or is not in State Department Telephone Directory, August 1946.

NOTE.—Of the list of 1,127 persons employed in the United States by State Department's OIC, 559 receive over \$4,000 per annum. Not one of the persons listed on the recent submission by the Department of State as being employed in the New York office is found on the 1944 list submitted by the Office of War Information for its New York office.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the remarks just made by my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], may I say that what he refers to are all details that can be corrected. If we fail to pass legislation that continues the Voice of America, then the opportunity to work

out conditions that might not be wholly satisfactory to some Members will not exist.

I call attention to what Secretary Marshall said before a Senate committee a day or two ago. Mark you, General Marshall was Chief of Staff during the war, a pretty substantial man, a man whose place in history is made. After

we are dead and gone and he is dead and gone, he will be one of the great figures of history of all time. We cannot see what a man is symbolic of or what he stands for or his place in history when we are close to him because there is an emotional reaction in the minds of some of us if not all of us, but in the cold light of history George Marshall is going to be one of the great figures of all times. There is no question about that.

Only a day or two ago he appeared before a Senate committee in connection with getting appropriations and with reference to this particular project he definitely promised that, if the money is appropriated, the program will be, and I quote, "Very carefully administered." When he appeared before the Senate committee he made a plea. The former Chief of Staff, now Secretary of State, was making this plea, realizing the importance of this as part of a permanent action by America which was necessary in the light of world conditions. We must also bear in mind this program goes to China, India, and southeast Asia, and that it will be silenced unless we do something.

The doors of 70 libraries in 41 countries will be closed to thousands of people who seek each day to learn something about the United States. We are battling, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] well said a few weeks ago in a powerful speech, an idea, and we have to fight it with our own idea—the ideas and the fundamentals that we believe in. We cannot do it by way of negation or by taking the road of defeatism.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Does it not seem rather strange that the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from New York are condemning these broadcasts and at the same time the most prominent Russian journalist in Berlin is desperately trying to counteract those broadcasts? That is strange to me.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in reply I desire to say that I said I had no objection to the broadcasting program provided General Marshall or Will Clayton, or men of their views supervised these broadcasts. But I do object to bringing men here from behind the iron curtain who cannot come unless they get the stamp of approval of a Communist regime.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have to keep in mind the basic line of Soviet strategy, which is to isolate the United States from the rest of the world if they can do it, and they are using every means to that end. There is intense propaganda from inside Russia and from the centers of communism outside of Russia constantly stressing that America is imperialistic and following dollar diplomacy. They are constantly attacking capitalism and the capitalistic nations. Capitalism is nothing but the dignity of the individual. I would like to see the dignity of the individual stressed more on the floor of the House rather than capitalism. Ours is an individual system. When you use the word capitalism, we are playing right into their hands when, as a matter of fact, it is nothing more or less than

the dignity of the individual under the law and of individual initiative. If we used the word capitalism less, then they would have less opportunity to use that characterization of our economic institutions which we understand but which they use to create a sinister meaning in the minds of people in other countries who do not realize what we mean. When you and I use the word capitalism we mean that it is synonymous with individual initiative and individual enterprise or free competitive enterprise, or, as others would say, free enterprise.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman admits that Russia wants to isolate the United States through propaganda in those countries. How are they going to hear the Voice of America if we do provide the funds for it? By what means is it going to penetrate to these people?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass because it is in the interests of the United States and it is a means of meeting and combating a sinister influence coming from the Soviet Union and its satellites which is directed at the United States and the future peace of the world.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the majority of us agree with the minority whip in his statements that Secretary Marshall is trying to do a good job. History will record his action and weigh his services today, yesterday, and tomorrow. It takes time to evaluate such services. Personally, I have always wondered where he was the night before Pearl Harbor and why he did not use the telephones to notify the military at Pearl Harbor, which could have been done 2 or 3 hours before the devastating attack was made at Pearl Harbor. It would have saved 2,700 lives and a tremendous loss of property. He used the slow commercial methods, and the message telling of the coming attack was delivered 2 hours late. Who can explain that problem?

Now, the gentleman read a part of what Secretary Marshall said about the Voice of America. Let me read the rest of what he said about the Voice of America. I agree with him absolutely. In appearing before the Senate committee, the press reports as follows:

Mr. Marshall said it is essential to the conduct of our foreign relations that the State Department have funds and freedom to make foreign broadcasts and conduct a world-wide information program.

As I have said before, one effective way to promote peace is to dispel misunderstanding, fear, and ignorance.

Foreign people should have a true understanding of American life. We should broadcast the truth to the world through all the media of communications.

That is what the press told the American people about the Voice of America.

I agree with that 100 percent. But, my colleagues, this bill does more than that. Unless it is radically amended, the bill goes much further than disseminating information through foreign broadcasts.

I would like to have the opportunity to vote for a bill providing for broadcast-

ing. Unless some Member of the minority offers a motion to recommit, I shall offer a motion to recommit along that line.

A letter came to me from a confidential source today showing the pressure for this bill. The letter is circulated by William T. Stone, who is under Mr. Benton in the State Department. To show you the pressure that is being put on, this is an interesting confidential letter on how to push this legislation through Congress. I think it is truly in violation of all the laws we set up for this Department. It is headed, "Memorandum for John Howe, Luther Reid, and Bill Bourne, in the State Department":

[Confidential]

MAY 1, 1947.

Memorandum for John Howe, Luther Reid, Bill Bourne.

Re: Action and recommendations of New York Alumni Committee.

At a luncheon meeting April 29, called by Louis Cowan, with Norman Cousins, Lim Linen, Harold Guinzburg, Mike Bessie, and Miss Singer present, the following recommendations were made:

1. The committee will distribute copies of our clip sheet to key people throughout the country for use in the press, radio, etc.

John Howe should send 150 to 200 copies to Miss Singer as secretary. We should also send 12 to 15 copies of the House committee hearings the moment they are available. The hearings will be used by the committee, columnists, editorial writers, etc.

Harold Guinzburg or Mike Bessie will talk to Liebling about an article in the New Yorker. (Memoirs of Hecate County article by Henning in Chicago Tribune, using Ehrenburg to show Voice of America ineffectual. Art program, etc.)

2. The committee agreed to contribute and receive funds up to \$1,000 for the Washington organization, headed by Mrs. Wayne Coy and Mrs. Bell. Funds for this purpose should be sent to Louis Cowan.

3. The group favored a news story rather than an advertisement in the Washington Post to publicize the high caliber of people supporting the information program. The consensus that a paid ad would be less effective than a general news story. The ad would look like part of a costly organized lobbying campaign.

4. It was suggested that Barney Baruch could be very helpful with top leaders in Congress. John Howe should follow up with Louis Cowan to determine the best approach to Baruch. Baruch has influence with VANDERBERG, TAFT, JOE MARTIN, and many other top leaders.

5. It was suggested that General Marshall cable personally to the heads of the important missions abroad requesting them to report to him on the effect of killing OIC.

6. The Greek broadcast should be publicized.

7. Benny Goodman has offered to help in any way possible. He will be in New York next Tuesday. The group agreed that there is not much that Goodman can do in Washington, but that he should be urged to get support from top people in the show business. Thayer will see him when he arrives in New York.

WILLIAM T. STONE.

Copies to Howland Sargeant, Stew Brown.

(NOTE.—Mr. Benton's office reports that the above was copied and circulated in his office in order that employees of the office would know what had occurred at this luncheon in New York, and that it was merely informative information for the employees of OIC.)

Thus, my colleagues, the pressure is on. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is of prime importance that the United States use every channel of information with respect to our own country. I think now that we have become the most influential Nation in the world, it is essential that we do so.

I do not believe in passing legislation with the idea that the one holding the office at the time the legislation is passed is the one who will continue to administer it; but in view of the fact that so much has been said about the Voice of America program and how it has been administered in the past, I think it is well to remember that George Marshall served as our Chief of Staff during the war. I have seen him operate under high pressure, and I know that he is not subject to it.

Some of my friends here think that the only people with whom we will be dealing in this will be the Russians. I have heard from a high military commander in Europe who was in a position to know, that in the war the Russians made two mistakes. They let the Russian Army see the rest of the world, and they let the rest of the world see the Russian Army. I do not believe you can anticipate any Russian students or professors being permitted to see the conditions under which we live in America.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] the other day stated that the Russians had found it necessary to give an indoctrination course in the beauties of communism before returning her soldiers to their own land.

I think we ought to take example from the nation which has been the most successful of all in international politics, the British. Her great empire builders wanted to do everything in their power to build the empire. When the great empire builder, Cecil Rhodes, decided to use his fortune to help build the empire he created Rhodes scholarships under which they have siphoned off into England for indoctrination the brightest boys that we have in our colleges in America; and I say that it has paid off and paid off wonderfully. Those of you who are afraid of dealing with Britain on the ground that the British are smarter than we are ought, at least, to be willing to accept the program by which Britain has profited so much.

I come from near the Mexican border. I have seen this thing in operation down there on a small scale in the small colleges and universities, and in some of the larger ones. They have been carrying on an exchange program, primarily in the summertime, so that Americans, probably mostly school teachers, can attend Mexican universities. It has been mutually beneficial. The Americans who have gone to Mexico had never sought companionship or association with Latin-Americans of culture and education, of whom there are thousands. When they went to the Mexican universities they found there—and this is so

in the other South American countries—the same percentage of men and women of refinement and education. They found that Latin-Americans have music, art, and culture comparable to any other country; that La Cucaracha, they learned, is the equivalent of our hillbilly songs, and not representative of their cultural music; and the Mexicans who have come to the United States had judged Americans by the rowdy tourists they had seen. They had read in their histories of the large section of Mexico taken by the Texas Revolution and the larger section taken by the Mexican War, and feared further attacks upon her borders. They have heard us referred to as "Gringoes" and our country as the "Colossus of the North." After they have been in this country and visited in our homes and seen our education and finer side of our life, they no longer think of us as "Gringoes." They no longer think of us as the "Colossus of the North," but as "Norte Americanos." They also learn here beyond all doubt that this country and the people of this country do not intend to acquire any more land anywhere in the world. So the program turns out to be mutually beneficial. I am sure it can be the same in any part of the world.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman spoke of General Marshall in connection with the administration of such law as might be enacted as a result of this bill. Does the gentleman believe that General Marshall himself will administer this law if it is passed, oversee it, and take charge of it?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not so believe. The gentleman must remember that General Marshall is a trained military administrator. Like every successful general, he knows better how to pick a staff than anybody else. I know, too, that he will positively insist that the man he appoints to carry out the program carry it out just as the general in command in the field will rely upon his G-2 and insist that his G-2 get him accurate information. I know, too, that he will permit no insubordination. The American that is he will formulate a truly American plan and woe to him who fails to carry it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, Congress is being called upon by this administration to appropriate large sums of money to support the so-called Truman policy overseas. Behind this program is an unquestioned desire to influence the course of European history. Our Government is attempting to stem

the tide of communism and state socialism in every possible way.

I regard these objectives as laudable, but the evidence accumulating every day makes it obvious that our methods are naive, wasteful, and utterly ineffective.

The administration policy is nothing but patchwork diplomacy. We are called upon one day to approve loans to Greece and Turkey as a means of stopping Communist threats in this area. The next day we are asked to furnish funds for the Voice of America in order to bring the message of American success into the homes of Europe and Asia, over radio loudspeakers. Presumably in the near future, we shall be asked to undertake additional ventures for the same purpose.

These are all demonstrations of a failure to analyze and interpret what is going on in Europe and Asia accurately and intelligently. These continents are in ferment. Because our own Government has refused to recognize the realities of the situation we have failed to complete vitally necessary treaties with the former members of the Axis and their satellites. We have allowed chaos and uncertainty to dominate the political and economic life of central Europe, a policy which has played directly into the hands of the Soviet Union.

Will the Voice of America broadcasts meet these critical issues? Will they furnish bread to the starving? Will they furnish political guidance to those who seek for stability in their governments? Will they rebuild the shattered industry or restore the ruined agriculture of devastated countries? In other words, is this appropriation the best possible use our people can make of these funds in this crucial moment in world history?

I submit that our Government is in the position of a small boy trying to protect the leaking dike. He may stop it temporarily at one place, but unless the dike is rebuilt speedily and completely, it is going to break in many more places while he is frantically plugging a tiny gap. We have been bolstering the dike of the status quo in Greece and Turkey, and now it has burst wide open in Hungary. If we spend our money and our energy repairing the break in Hungary, we may find a new threat in Italy or Korea or China.

The process is endless. I urge our Government and those who seek an effective foreign policy for our guidance to use the funds we are asked to expend for the Voice of America to provide a voice that will really be heard.

Let our Government in company with the other nations of the world provide the means of economic rehabilitation to every European and Asiatic country through the international agencies we have helped to create. Strong, self-reliant, working people will not succumb to Communist propaganda feeding on unemployment and despair. We have machines for industry; we have machines for farming. Let us provide these to the needy of the world.

Let us end this patchwork diplomacy and build a constructive foreign policy which will last longer than one edition of our newspapers. We can do it by

spending our funds for a voice of America that will be heard throughout the world, the voice of American motors and tractors and harvesters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to all of the debate on this bill, and have reached the conclusion that I will support the bill although I shall also support some of the amendments which I believe will be offered.

I have taken this time in order to ask certain questions of the chairman of the subcommittee; questions which have bothered me.

We have been told that Russia is subjecting all of its troops who served outside the limits of the Russian border to 90-day reindoctrination courses in the ideals of the Soviet Government. The State Department has been publishing this Russian language magazine called *Amerika* which, generally speaking, is a fine piece of work. I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why, on the one hand, the Soviet Government spends money to reindoctrinate its soldiers and, on the other hand, permits this sort of magazine to enter Russia.

The second question is: How do we know that these magazines are not all thrown in the ash can as soon as they cross the Russian border?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct, in the first place, about the indoctrination course being given Russian soldiers returning from service in western Europe. They not only give a 90-day indoctrination course for the ordinary returning soldiers of the Red Army, but if they are members of the Communist Party of Russia they give them a 12-month indoctrination course, because they want to be sure to retain party control and party discipline over their own converts. Now, why do they take such care about indoctrinating their own men and still permit us to circulate our periodical *Amerika* in the U. S. S. R.? They permit us to circulate *Amerika* over there because from the Russian Embassy on Sixteenth Street, in Washington, every Wednesday afternoon they issue a magazine patterned after *Time* magazine in format, about half that big, printed on slick paper, which they circulate free every week to any American who wants to get on the list. They realize that they cannot continue to issue their paper in America should they refuse to let us circulate our publication over there. So we are getting some gratifying successful results by circulating *Amerika* in the U. S. S. R.

The next question you asked was "How do we know that those magazines are not all thrown in the ash can?" Remember, first of all, there are very few ash cans in Russia and they have very little to discard in the ash cans. Travelers in Russia, people in our Embassy and people in the army all have provided convincing evidence that our magazine *Amerika* is being circulated and read. I, myself,

circulated over 50 of those magazines in Russia in 1945. I know how eagerly they reach out for them. I personally have seen copies in hotel lobbies in Leningrad, Baku, and Moscow. I have seen them in the subway trains. They are being circulated, and they are being sold on the black market for \$1 a page, in terms of our American money. The Russians want to get them. We are stupid, indeed, if we deny ourselves by our own shortsightedness the use of this important contact which we have made with the people both behind and in front of the iron curtain.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman. I come now to my third question.

The committee has said that it is the purpose this program to make certain that the American information program abroad shall be truly reflective of our American way of life. In this copy of *Amerika* that I hold in my hand is a story on the play *The Iceman Cometh*. If I recollect the argument of that play, there is not a character in it that is not a criminal, a drunkard, a prostitute, or a pervert. I also find in the hearings before the committee that Mr. Dean Acheson justifies broadcasting stories of American lynchings. I do not feel that the true American way of life is portrayed in that play or in accounts of mob lynchings. I would like to have assurance from the subcommittee chairman, if he can give it, that this program is going to sell the fine things that are America and not the seamy things.

Mr. MUNDT. We have set up a number of safeguards to insure that. We have provided for semiannual reports in detail to every Member of Congress as to what is being done on the program. Thus each Member of Congress can help monitor and formulate this new program. I regret that a play of that kind has been published in this magazine, but if my memory serves me correctly, "*The Iceman Cometh*" is a play by Eugene O'Neill, one of America's most noted playwrights who, unfortunately, writes shoddy plays. The Americans pay money in the boxoffice to see them, and it makes him an outstanding playwright in the area of the dramatic world. Consequently, we cannot be too critical of those preparing the copy of "*Amerika*" for including a review of O'Neill's "*Iceman Cometh*" in their discussion of the American theater. However, under the new program set up by H. R. 3342 has many congressional safeguards not now operating. I am sure we can use these new controls to make sure our American information program abroad does concentrate on the fine qualities of American life and not on lynchings, strikes, crime, and riots.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is high time that we got away from this fog of opinion and into the area of fact. As I understand it, when the Congress considers a bill it likes to have a few facts.

There are an awful lot of brickbats thrown at this provision in title II for student exchange. It is very interesting to see the opinions of those who, I be-

lieve, even the opponents of this bill will consider to be very substantial people, on this subject. So I read a telegram which I have just received from the acting president of Columbia University, which is located within my district. It is as follows:

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building:

Understand effort is being made to eliminate provision of Mundt bill authorizing promotion of exchange of students and teachers between United States and other countries. Hope very much provision will stand as such exchanges are important method of establishing international understanding. Means of handling possible abuses should be found without abolishing so important a program.

FRANK DIEHL FACKENTHAL,
Acting President of Columbia University.

I just telephoned President Fackenthal and got his permission to read this telegram into the RECORD. He said that he did not like to get into any controversy, obviously, and that he wanted it understood that he was not giving an expert opinion on the bill as a whole, but that on the matter of student and teacher exchanges he thought that it was so critically important to the fate of America and the world and to the fate of American education that he must, as a responsible person, express his views to the Congress.

There are some 4,000 students from Latin America who are studying in the United States and no students, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] has explained, who are studying here from Soviet Russia. The only reason there are 4,000 students from Latin America is that it is the only part of the world which is covered by a law which states that the United States will sponsor those student exchanges. So the Government sponsorship, which is what all these foreign governments want when they send students over here—to be sure that the matter is being handled under our Government's auspices—is making the program with Latin America work. Even the most determined opponents of this bill will admit that one of the great features in building up the good will between our country and the Latin American countries has been this exchange, and they should wish we had more of it.

Do not let us get distracted by this red herring or bogie that is being dragged across the floor here all the time. This student and teacher exchange is a program which goes to the world. It is a key element in our American foreign policy. The facts do not bear out the arguments which are being made against it that it will admit undesirable people, for there are adequate safeguards about letting them in and adequate safeguards about getting them out if they prove to be undesirable. The arguments against the bill are being made on the basis of the wishful thinking of gentlemen who want to defeat this legislation—just as they want to defeat any legislation which proposes that the United States shall do a job of reconstruction in the world, the only way in which we can protect our own security and prosperity.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman about what the facts bear out. I should like to advise the gentleman that in a conference with some of the officials of the State Department the day before yesterday the admission was made to me very frankly that many of these things that have been objected to on the floor of the House had been done, and the promise was made that they would be corrected in the future. So evidently the facts are not exactly as the gentleman has represented them. Either the State Department is wrong or the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman's assertion is correct, we would never have sent an army to Europe because there was some incompetence and inefficiency in the Army and Navy here. What we are arguing about in this bill is that the job ought to be done. All the Congress is doing by this bill is authorizing the job to be done. We will see that it is carried out right if the necessary machinery is provided. But if the machinery is not provided there is nothing to work with.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Who does the gentleman mean by "we?"

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. By "we" I mean all the American people. There is no department or bureau that can withstand their judgment, and the Congress is here to see that it is obeyed.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. I shall favor a motion to recommit it to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. When I make that statement it is not criticism of the committee. I know that the committee has acted in good faith, but the whole philosophy accepted by that committee from the State Department is wrong.

That committee in fact is wandering around and is lost in the dismal swamps of the State Department. The time has come when Congress, as a whole, must call a halt to the foreign ideologies in the State Department and again truly represent our own philosophy.

I used to believe in the law of averages. I thought any person, according to the law of averages, would hit upon the right thing once in awhile. I believe that we must now, however, adopt the law of accident as far as the State Department is concerned, because if it ever hits it right it will be by accident.

Let us see just where we are going. We have already depleted our natural resources from 11 percent to less than 9 percent of the world's supply. The theory of the State Department is to give away the wealth we have left, so that a few international coupon clippers and manufacturers can increase their wealth at the expense of the American taxpayer.

No nation ever became great or remained great by giving away its natural resources, by denuding the nation of the raw material that belongs to unborn generations. Our Nation became great because we had an abundance of wealth—natural resources—but now we are asked

to believe in the doctrine of giving away that which belongs to future generations. To me this seems morally wrong, religiously sinful, and legally criminal. It verges on treason.

There seems to be a fatal disease rampant here in this House. It is not exactly sleeping sickness, but it does destroy our alertness and dulls our sense of responsibility. It is called "foreignology." Even my good friend from South Dakota finally caught it. I had thought that his prairie vision and robust health made him immune, but there must have been too many germs of that disease from the State Department in the Foreign Affairs Committee room.

This foreignology would ape Hitler, and proclaim to the world that America has a superior culture. It parallels *Mein Kampf*. It would attempt to impress the culture and questionable ideologies of the State Department upon the rest of the world. It would try to make the world believe that we have a superior civilization, and that our taxpayers must educate the world to accept our ideologies.

If permitted in its wildness, and in its insanity, it will destroy our Nation the same as it destroyed the German nation. The German people are now paying for the folly of Hitler and his followers. It is silly for any nation to undertake to force its thoughts and its ideas upon the rest of mankind, especially when they do not want them.

In place of trying to educate the world to our way of thinking—to accept our ideologies and culture—we had better pay a little more attention to the education of some of our own people. My friend from South Dakota could more profitably spend his time in educating some of the subversive element he is struggling with in the Un-American Activities Committee. He has been doing a good job. When he has finished the job at home—when he has educated and made good Americans of the subversive element within our midst—then I am sure he will be satisfied to let the rest of the world do their own educating.

Our first duty is still to educate ourselves, not foreigners. There are many things about our boasted culture—our labor problems, and our under-privileged—that need first attention. We are still far from perfect. "He who lives in a glass house should not throw stones," is still good advice. We have already gotten the hatred of many nations because of our Hitler-like attempt to boss the rest of the world.

Just of what value is broadcasting turkey in the imaginary straw of Russia. Of what help is it to the starving of the vanquished nations to send dancing girls, and questionable movies and programs to them. Naturally these nations resent it. To them it is adding insult to injury—insult because we collaborated with Stalin, and helped in their liquidation.

Again, behind the scenes of this legislation are some members of the State Department who want to put the United States Government into the broadcasting business. They have advocated a government controlled International Broadcasting Foundation to take over

short wave broadcasting and disseminate American views throughout the world.

Even though the proposal is sugar coated by a vague suggestion that domestic broadcasting companies and some institutions be represented on the board of trustees, the Government would run the show just as firmly as the British Government runs propaganda through BBC.

The State Department is already up to its neck in the field of international broadcasting, with programs going out in 25 different languages at a cost of more than \$8,000,000 per year. The proposed foundation would make continuation of this war-born propaganda activity a permanent part of our Government, with substantial expansion and increase in cost.

In my opinion, this is a bad and extremely dangerous proposal.

Here would be another instance of unnecessary Government competition with private enterprise, and in a field where American private enterprise has been notably successful. Imperfect as American broadcasting may be, it leads the world as a provider of entertainment and education, and, as a force for influencing popular opinion. Government-controlled broadcasting systems in other countries have never approached American commercial broadcasting in popularity—the United States has more broadcasting stations and more privately owned radio receivers than the rest of the world combined.

Long before the war American broadcasting companies, entirely at their own expense and with little prospect for financial return, erected and operated short-wave stations that sent American network programs all over the world. In countries where short-wave receivers were in general use, these American commercial programs were far more popular than the stodgy propaganda broadcasts from Germany, France, England, Italy, Spain, and so forth. They did more to sell American ideals and the American way of life than could any number of pontifical presentations of "the unvarnished truth," such as the State Department's much publicized broadcasts to the Soviets.

At the time of Pearl Harbor there were 14 licensed international short-wave stations operating in the United States. All were erected by private capital, all were operated by their owners at a total cost over the years of many millions of dollars. During the war Government funds were used in construction and operation of additional short-wave stations, just as Government money was used to construct and operate munition factories, ship yards, and so forth. Now that the war is over, these stations should be sold to private operators in the same manner, and for the same reason, that other Government-financed properties are passing into private hands.

There is no more reason for the Government to own and operate broadcasting stations than there is for it to publish newspapers and magazines. Nor is there any reason for the Government,

which has neither experience nor skill in radio production, to spend millions of dollars developing radio programs.

Fairness and common sense demand that the Government pay for and use privately owned broadcasting facilities for dispatching radio programs, just as it uses railroads for dispatching freight, telegraph and cable systems for dispatching messages, our newspapers and magazines for publishing advertisements and releasing news, and so forth. Instead of setting up a system to compete with those who pioneered our international short-wave stations, any Government money used for this purpose should be spent to support those who blazed the trail with their own private funds. Any other procedure would be the rankest kind of injustice, as well as being a stupid refusal to use the world's finest creative talent in the realm of radio.

No matter what our bureaucrats choose to call Government-sponsored international broadcasts of "unvarnished truth," listeners in other lands will have just one term for them: "Yankee propaganda." Most Americans resent or laugh at foreign propaganda that infiltrates this country, and are highly skeptical of news and radio broadcasts that come through the iron curtain of censorship. To all other peoples of the world we Americans are foreigners; obviously Yankee propaganda will only serve to arouse resentment and skepticism of all things American.

The one basic idea that the United States has to sell to the rest of the world is our American system of free enterprise. What could be more futile and ridiculous than using a bureaucratic broadcasting foundation to tell our story? What profit could there be in prattling the "unvarnished truth" about free America when the listener knows that the programs he hears are themselves a violation of the basic principles of American free enterprise? Why should we adopt the very practices that we criticize in other governments?

The most effective method of persuasion is by actual demonstration. There could be no better way of demonstrating to other peoples the real meaning of American free enterprise and freedom of speech than by giving them an opportunity to hear the tremendous variety of radio programs that are aired each day over our major networks. In the year 1946 American advertisers paid a bill of \$78,000,000 for the broadcasting talent alone that produced these programs. What a revelation it would be to countless impoverished millions to hear commercial announcers vying with each other to sell more soap, candy, automobiles, radios, watches, cigarettes, etc., etc. And what a demonstration of democracy in action it would be to have people of the world hear two opposing American presidential candidates tear into each other over the radio, and then hear the election results, and learn that the loser continued to enjoy life and freedom.

American radio programs, in spite of criticism leveled at them by Blue Book writers, have the happy faculty of attracting large audiences. This is true in

other countries as well as in the United States. If our daily schedules of network programs were sent out by powerful short waves, we would soon create an incredible amount of good will and understanding throughout the world. American jazz is popular from the Arctic to Timbuctu, and there is plenty of that broadcast every day. Serious music has its lovers wherever there are human beings—they reach for everything from Bach to Gershwin. American networks broadcast many hours of the world's finest music every week. Music is the only international language that needs no translation. Our dramatic programs, variety shows, news casts, commentaries, etc., have a freshness and freedom found on no other radio broadcasting system on earth. True enough, some of these programs would require translation for a good part of our audience, but many could go straight, with perhaps explanatory announcements in other languages. It must not be forgotten that in virtually all countries there is a large nucleus of English speaking people.

If we wish to do a really effective job of international broadcasting, the way to do it is to forget all about bureaucratic foundations and send by short wave a selected schedule of network programs, modifying them only as prudent commercial practice dictates. I used the words "prudent commercial practice" because I believe that the best way, as well as the most American way, of sending our commercial programs overseas is to permit American short-wave stations to sell time to advertisers just as our domestic stations do. That will automatically bring to American international broadcasting the best audience-building brains of the country, and give to the rest of the world the great musical and dramatic talent that has made radio so popular in America. Under the acid spur of commercial results, broadcasters will develop new techniques of audience building in foreign lands that will far transcend the best efforts possible for a known Government agency.

Then, if the Government still deems it necessary to enter officially the international war of words, it will find an enormous and receptive audience waiting for its programs from privately owned stations. It will also have available, and should use, the skill developed by free enterprise in radio, just as it found available and used for munition production the industrial skill developed by generations of free enterprise in manufacturing.

Both for the sake of economy and to give the rest of the world a true understanding of America, the State Department should be compelled to cease its present international broadcasting activities, and any proposal that the Government enter the broadcasting business should be defeated. The American broadcasting industry should be given an opportunity to expand in the field of commercial international broadcasting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time in search of information. I recognize the value of bringing students in from other countries so that they can become familiar with how we do things in the United States, but I am also mindful of the fact that we are having much difficulty finding schools and rooms for American students who wish to secure an education for which we are paying a tremendous sum.

It is possible that the president of Columbia University has the facilities where they can take in a good many thousands of students from other countries, but the situation is somewhat different in other colleges and universities.

About a year ago the State Department had a plan to bring in 10,000 young foreigners to study medicine in this country. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee who handled this legislation will answer this question, and possibly also my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota. The program of the State Department was to bring in 10,000 medical students from foreign countries or students who wanted to study medicine, to train and educate them in the United States, which was, of course, a very fine thing. But in talking to one of the distinguished doctors out in my section of the country I found that this doctor, after a thorough investigation, had come to the conclusion that we did not have enough medical schools and facilities in our medical schools to educate the few American boys and girls who wanted to take up medicine. So that my first question is whether or not the State Department has the same program of bringing in 10,000 young foreign students to train them in medicine in this country?

Mr. JUDD. May I say to my friend and colleague from Minnesota that this is the first time that I have heard of such a figure as he has mentioned. We have had—or rather the State Department has had—authority under previous legislation to bring in students from Latin-American countries—graduate students, not undergraduate students—for study in medicine, as well as other fields. There are some 6,500 students from Latin America studying in the United States today. All of them are on their own resources or on scholarships, taking care of their own expenses, except 377. These are exceptional individuals who do not have sufficient resources of their own. After they qualified by competitive examination, the State Department assists them in the degree they need. Only 377 out of 6,500 receive aid under the present program.

It is contemplated, if this bill goes through and the same authority is extended to the rest of the world, that the program for Europe and Asia will be about twice as big as for Latin America. That will increase the number of students in the United States under this program from 377 to perhaps a thousand a year in all fields, including medicine.

I have never heard of any proposal to train here 10,000 a year in medicine. It would be impossible to carry out, even if it were not absurd.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That probably was one of the top secrets of the State Department that was not passed on to your committee.

I feel that it is our first duty to take care of American boys and girls who want to take up medicine and let them have an opportunity in our own institutions.

I might say with reference to the fellowships that have been granted to doctors who are coming here to be trained in our various hospitals and medical clinics that the complaint is—and I know it to be true—that after these men have spent 2 and 3 years here studying under the fellowship and getting the benefits of our American system and American training they do not want to return to the countries from which they have come. The big problem is for the men in charge of these medical institutions where these men are trained under the fellowships to get them to go back to the countries from which they come.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with this bill. It seeks to cover too much territory. Unless the bill is drastically amended, it appears to me that the State Department is given a blank check to do whatever suits the fancy of Mr. Benton or some of his associates, who have been engaged in sending to foreign countries so much propaganda giving an unfavorable picture of what American democracy means. The first step in shaping a policy to take care of propaganda should be to dismiss those in the State Department who had deliberately sought to cast reflection on our American system. After this has been done, the Congress can formulate a truly American policy, which I will gladly support. I therefore hope that this bill will be amended before a final vote is taken. To begin with, a limitation should be placed on the amount of money to be allowed to tell peoples of the world about the United States and, secondly, the bill should be redrafted so that the Congress will know what is being authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I heard a humorist, some time ago, say something like this: "You know, we human beings do not have too much to get puffed up about, anyhow." He said in the first place we are made wrong. For instance, he said, you take the mouth. It is in a very unsanitary place, right under your nose. The truth of the matter is it should be on top of your head so that if you were late for work you could put a sandwich under your hat and eat it on the way. Take your leg, for instance; it is made wrong. You have your padding back here where you don't need it and here on your shins, where you do need it, you don't have any padding at all.

He said, "Take your lap. You lose it right when you need it most. When you stand up you may drop something of value and break it since your lap is gone."

"Take your toe," he said, "it is too far from your brain. You may get up in the night sometime and step on a tack, and

what happens?" The toe sends a message to the brain and says, "Toe on tack." The brain sends a message back and says, "Take toe off tack." Yet all that time you are standing on the tack waiting for the messages to go back and forth. He said, "You can sit down but one way. Why I was in a theater the other night and a lady hollered, 'Sit down in front.'" He said, "I tried to and came darn near killing myself."

The point I make is simply this: You can take most anything in the world and ridicule it and criticize it. Of course you can. Some of you very fine, able members of this committee have criticized this bill and have criticized it, I believe, far out of proportion to its actual reality. Now, surely, folk—and you are a fine bunch of folk—patriotic, intelligent, sincere American citizens—surely we should not carry our suspicions so far that we just suspicion everybody. Certainly we are against communism. Certainly we are against fascism. Certainly we are against all subversive elements in America. But let us not lose our civil liberties in our efforts against these subversive elements. Let us not abandon our civil liberties. Let us not go too far. Let us not do un-American things in our effort to combat them. Let us not suspicion everybody. I have heard suspicion directed at the Supreme Court of the United States. I have heard suspicion directed at the President. I have heard suspicion directed at the State Department. I am afraid that if some of you gentlemen are not careful, you will start suspicioning yourselves. You could carry it so far that you would finally be afraid of yourselves; afraid to read anything or afraid to hear anything lest you be improperly influenced.

Now, I think we have carried it to an absurd degree. I really do. I just believe we should not do that. If there ever was a man who lived on the face of the earth who would never be a Communist or a Fascist or anything but an American, it is I. Yet I do not have that fear that some have, because I do not believe it is justified by the facts. Certainly I do not have any suspicion that a man as patriotic as General Marshall is, a man who has shown the disposition that he as Secretary of State has shown would ever, even carelessly, permit communism to be fostered in this Department. I believe that some are carrying suspicions just a little too far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] read a telegram from the acting president of the great University of Columbia because some time ago Columbia University tried to acquire from the Pacific coast a new president.

I would like to read a telegram from Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, on the subject of the interchange of students. He is one of the outstanding educators of this country, a gentleman above any suspicion or taint of un-Americanism.

The telegram from Dr. Sproul reads as follows:

BERKELEY, CALIF., June 10, 1947.
Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In past years the University of California has trained hundreds of men and women from foreign countries and sent them home with a better understanding of the United States and of democracy to teach or to hold other positions of responsibility. It is my firm conviction that such interchange of students and teachers is a most effective way of promoting international understanding. May I urge you to see that nothing is done to prevent the promotion of such interchange by amendment of section of 201 of the Mundt bill.

ROBERT G. SPROUL,
President, University of California.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to hear that the University of California, along with the University of Columbia, and, although I did not graduate from a very big college—just a little fresh-water college in the Midwest, Carlton College, in the State of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]—it is a pleasure to receive from my college a telegram urging the Congress to retain 201. It is a terribly important part of the program to the people out in the Midwest. They believe that the extension and development of mutual understanding is the basis of peace.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

I wish also to read a telegram from Dr. Lynn T. White, president of Mills College, in Oakland, Calif., one of the foremost women's colleges in the United States—a college established in 1852, that has done a great deal to bring about better understanding between this country and the Orient and this country and South America.

President White wires:

MILLS COLLEGE, CALIF., June 10, 1947.
Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your support of Mundt bill including information program. Living experience provided by international exchange of persons best means of insuring mutual esteem. Information program sorely needed to overcome existing block in international understanding.

LYNN T. WHITE,
President, Mills College.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw upon our own experiences. After the Boxer Uprising in 1899 this country refused to accept indemnity from China, but we provided that the interest on the money that would have been paid us should be used in the education of Chinese students in this country. That program is now 47 years old. We have brought young Chinese to this country and have educated them and sent them back to their homeland, and they have been the greatest bond between China and this country. They are responsible for the understanding that exists between China and this country.

Again may I call your attention to something that has been brought out here—but I should like to stress it—we are not just directing this program toward Russia; there is also the great Pacific Basin, the virile part of the world, that part of the world that is demanding reform. This program is going there—going to a part of the world that respects us and looks to us for leadership. We need the good will it will generate there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

Without objection, all pro forma amendments will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 203. The Secretary is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, or serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States. In assisting any such schools, however, the Secretary shall exercise no control over their educational policies.

Mr. HOFFMAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I have a motion on the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. To what section?

Mr. HOFFMAN. To section 201, page 3.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, section 201 has been passed. Section 202 has been passed. Time has expired on 202.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on section 202.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacKINNON] advises me that the time was not limited on amendments to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was limited on section 202.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On amendments also?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I believe if the Chairman will check the record he will find no mention was made to limit time on amendments, but only to limiting time on the bill. I observed the language very carefully when the request was submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot be right in his observation, for the motion was not to limit debate on the bill but only to that section which had been read.

Mr. MacKINNON. I mean on the section. The motion was only to limit time of debate on the section. The words "and amendments thereto" were not included.

I make that point of order. May we have it checked?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will overrule the point of order because the motion was made to close all debate with reference to any amendments to section 202. The question now is on section 203, which the Clerk is reading.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MacKINNON. What will be the situation if the Chair is in error in the Chair's recollection according to the record?

The CHAIRMAN. We will have to decide that when we come to it.

Mr. MacKINNON. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May we have a copy of that part of the record?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may secure that from the reporters.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 19, after the word "policies", insert the following: "And shall in no case furnish assistance of any character which is not in keeping with the free democratic principles and the established foreign policy of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which it was desired to offer was to section 201, page 3, line 10, to strike out the words "and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill." The Chairman failed to see or hear me so I did not obtain recognition.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of that proposed amendment was to prevent the State Department from bringing into this country agents of Russia or of any country that was under its domination or of any other country, which might become an enemy country, who had exceptional skill, who might desire, and who would under this bill be permitted to go into the industrial plants of our country and learn our methods and our secrets of production, the things which have enabled us in both wars to come out as winners.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] said that we were the victims of undue fear. I am wondering just how much of truth there is in that. I will admit that I am afraid for the future of my country and I know other folks who are afraid of what the departments down here are doing or may do.

In November last the people did the best they could to get a housecleaning in the legislative branch and they relied to a certain extent upon the legislative branch to help out with a housecleaning in the executive departments. Of course, they could not directly do anything about the executive departments.

It does seem that the least those who were elected to the Eightieth Congress

can do, the very least they can do, is to keep the faith of those who elected them, to refuse to give additional power, blank checks for power and blank checks for money, to these departments which refuse to carry out the will of Congress, departments which are still New Deal in thought and deed. The gentleman may not be afraid of any department's action. I am.

I recall that book written by that admitted liar, Carlson. Under Cover, the book was titled, which charged some ninety-odd Members of the Congress of the United States with entertaining seditious ideas, charged them with being guilty, if you please, of treason.

Now, I say to you that in my office I have letters from the War Department which show that the War Department purchased and circulated that book.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, the gentleman used my name.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If everybody had to yield that used my name, calling names or something—

Mr. MORRIS. I just wanted to ask a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now.

Not only that but a gentleman came in this morning and suggested that, if the chairman of his subcommittee would not go through with it, he was asking our committee to permit him to offer evidence—now listen to this—that the War Department made possible the publication and the circulation of Under Cover.

Have we reason to be afraid? There is not a Member of this House who has been here for the last 4 or 5 years who does not know from the admissions of the State Department, the individuals in it, that in that Department over the years there have been not one but dozens of Communists, and, when Congressmen, notably the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], asked that those fellows be taken out of the State Department, they got just nowhere with their requests.

Now, until the executive departments down at the other end of the Avenue clean house, we should be afraid; I am more fearful of the borers from within than I am of Russia—we should be afraid of what this State Department, or the people in it or in other departments—will do to this country of ours, because no matter what legislation we enact they take it and turn it and twist it and use it to further some purpose of their own. While on the whole, their efforts may have been all right, here and there, all through, we find the Communist trail, the Communist taint.

So, let me repeat, that the trouble with this thing always—most of this legislation, anyway—is that if the legislation is good, we know from past experience that it will be misinterpreted and maladministered, and for that reason I cannot vote for legislation of this kind giving the State Department a blank check for power and money.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not so much concerned at the moment about the

propaganda provisions of this legislation, which seems to be the chief concern of the Foreign Affairs Committee. My chief concern is the immigration features which, in my opinion, compose about nine-tenths of the bill. This is a bill to bring people into this country.

I want to direct your attention specifically to section 20 on page 3, and paragraphs 3, 4, 5, and 6 under title VII, and more particularly to title VIII.

You can well understand that my time is not sufficient to read and discuss each of these sections, but the bill is short and you can read them in a very few minutes.

It was my pleasure to serve on the Immigration and Naturalization Committee for 4 years, and I am somewhat familiar with the antics of this Administration when it comes to dealing with immigration.

As I read this bill, it practically voids our existing immigration laws and authorizes the Secretary of State to admit persons to this country absolutely without limitation. All quotas are disregarded and the safeguards we have set up over the past 150 years becomes meaningless.

The debate on Tuesday was confined principally to the exchange of students. This bill provides for the exchange of teachers, instructors, leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill, and in a manner provides for the entry of an adult person who can walk or talk from any part of Europe and Asia, or any other part of the world. When we talk of teachers and students, just remember that Europe at this time is full of scientists and specialists, and the camps for displaced persons and others are full of experts. In short, this measure gives the Secretary of State authority to admit persons without any limitation as to number or length of time they are to stay in this country.

Section 801 of title 8 provides that the Secretary can accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States. Consequently, under this bill any racial group, political group, religious group, or any organization or society whatsoever, can support and bring people of every description to this country under this bill without number. As the bill is now written, it is possible to bring people into this country just as fast as transportation facilities will permit. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the number may reach one million annually, regardless of the appropriation or allotment to the State Department.

Now let us look at another feature of the program. When and if any person admitted under this program is found undesirable for any reason he is delivered to the Attorney General to be deported under the Immigration Act of 1917. This change of authority alone gives cause for suspicion of the purpose of this act. The Attorney General's office in respect to deporting undesirable aliens, remind one of a slow-motion picture of the Rock of Ages.

Under the existing conditions in Europe it is quite likely that any or all of

them may become displaced persons after they enter the United States and it will be declared that he cannot be returned home because the political situation has changed in his country. So we have him or her as a visiting refugee along with the other millions.

Another fact I want to impress upon you is that if one of these visitors marries an American citizen during their stay in this country they cannot be deported, or at least that is the history of the Immigration Department, because they immediately become a hardship case. In the case of children, they are residents of this country for the remainder of their life.

I plead with you to give this bill your serious consideration. It is my firm conviction that if it becomes law it will practically nullify all of our immigration laws and permit the free flow of people into this country, a situation that not a single Member of the House wants to support. And just remember the 2 or 3 years of the OWI.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the further consideration of the pending bill moderation both in feeling and expression shall prevail. It is my conviction that the gentleman who has just yielded the floor is entirely mistaken as to the purposes and the effect of the bill. It is not intended, I am sure, to be used for the purpose of indiscriminate admittance of people to this country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that by the time this debate has ended the Department of State will have realized that the deadeast thing in this country at this time, at least so far as this House is concerned, is the philosophy now expounded by the Wallace group, and that the Department will proceed speedily to bring itself in line with public thinking and will never again commit the serious blunder of admitting into the Department those who have heretofore sought to use it as an instrument in the hands of the reformer to make over the world into some kind of Marxist state.

The opposition to the bill that still prevails here in the House is grounded upon a lack of confidence in the State Department to administer the measure in an Americanlike way.

The Department has brought down upon its head more criticism than is well for the country's good. While improvement has been made in the screening of personnel, I, too, share the feeling that there are still those within the Department who have no business being there. Getting rid of these objectionable people, however, is not altogether an easy thing to do and we must be patient.

The memoranda referred to and exhibited here on the floor this morning by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and apparently bearing the signature of Mr. Stone, may have been prepared with innocent intentions, but the fact remains that it was used by a group of fellow travelers in New York identifying themselves as some kind of professional group to propagandize the Congress and the country in behalf of the adoption of the bill. That, too, was a

mistake. That, too, is something that the Department should hereafter avoid indulging in.

The bill probably is not as good as proponents wish. Certainly, it is not as bad as the opposition contend. I think there are some parts of the bill in addition to those already eliminated that the committee might well agree should go out. This can be done without weakening the measure and probably will be done.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the criticism of Bill Benton has largely ceased. I think the committee has the feeling that he has been unfairly dealt with. Speaking for myself, I would like to say that my interest in the bill would wane to some extent were I not confident that he will continue in charge of this informational program.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the floor because of the lack of time. This is an extremely important matter which we are debating here, and there has been demonstrated on the floor extraordinary ability on both sides of the question.

I do not question the motives of those who have spoken on either side of the question. I am opposed to this bill because I believe it is not at this time in the interests of the country. I expect to be open to criticism by the intolerance of those who are fanatically favorable to this bill.

I want to read a little extract to the Members of the House by a man whose patriotism I am sure cannot be questioned because he was really one of the founders of this country.

I refer to Alexander Hamilton, in the *Federalist*, No. 71. He said:

The republican principle demands that the deliberative sense of the community should govern the conduct of those to whom they entrust the management of their affairs; but it does not require an unqualified complaisance to every sudden breeze of passion, or to every transient impulse which the people may receive from the arts of men, who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests. It is a just observation that the people commonly intend the public good. This often applies to their very errors. But their good sense would despise the adulator who should pretend that they always reason right about the means of promoting it. They know from experience that they sometimes err; and the wonder is that they so seldom err as they do, beset, as they continually are, by the wiles of parasites and sycophants, by the snares of the ambitious, the avaricious, the desperate, by the artifices of men who possess their confidence more than they deserve it, and of those who seek to possess rather than to deserve it. When occasions present themselves, in which interests of the people are at variance with their inclinations, it is the duty of the persons whom they have appointed to be the guardians of those interests to withstand the temporary delusion, in order to give them time and opportunity for more cool and sedate reflection. Instances might be cited in which a conduct of this kind has saved the people from very fatal consequences of their own mistakes, and has procured lasting monuments of their gratitude to the men who had courage and magnanimity enough to serve them at the peril of their displeasure.

So that those of us who who oppose some of these measures, do so because we feel we are protecting the rights of the people against the inflammatory passions of the hour, which result from propaganda poured in upon them by certain departments of Government. We must not forget that never before in the history of the entire world has there been a more powerful propaganda agency than is created right here in the United States of America, and it works day and night. People hear this propaganda. Many times they are so excited over it, and the various other legislative problems that come up, that they do not reason it clear through. I believe it is the duty of those who see danger in some of these bills, as I do in this one, to have the courage and the Americanism to stand up here and state it, without being ridiculed. I do not know just how much time I have remaining, but it is utterly impossible for me to go very far, so I shall not go further at this time because I want to discuss another phase of it. But I do want to drive home to those present here that we who take opposition to these bills, the support for which is built up by a terrific blanket of propaganda—it is the duty to analyze these bills to the very core, and to stand here and vote against them if we believe we are right in doing so, in the interest of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it is not possible at this time, after those who are now on their feet have had an opportunity to speak, to limit debate on the pro forma amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MATHEWS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I just want to be sure that I get my full 5 minutes on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what is the gentleman's request?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this bill 4 or 5 days ago. It certainly cannot be claimed that I am unfriendly to the State Department, because I have gone down the line with them on everything that they have asked for this session. I did that as I said the other day as in the matter of the Greek-Turkish loan for one reason, because I took General Marshall and

the President at their word that it was a step towards stopping communism in Europe; but I do reserve the right to object to something like this monstrosity which comes along to us here which does not conform to its title—the Voice of America—to speak out against those provisions in it that I think are going to be inimical to our own country, such as exchanging students, professors and technicians.

Now, I think I have a right to be just a little alarmed about this thing and I can speak with just a little bit of authority. I do not feel as complacent as a lot of my friends do here. I spent 2 of my 4 years in the Army in Military Intelligence, investigating the Reds and the Pinks here in our country. I found that the people that they worked with most were those in our educational institutions and that they usually send their cookie-pushers over here from Europe. Knowing what I do of their methods I certainly am going to speak out against this thing, for it is not a good thing. Let us wait 3 or 4 years until this crisis that the President and General Marshall tell us about has settled itself somewhat, has died down. If then it appears to be a good thing we can consider it in a different aspect. Let us wait until we see how much good faith Russia shows.

These students under this program are not going to come from Russia, they are going to come from France, China and Belgium and other countries, and the ones they will send over here will be those bespectacled intellectuals they take out of their universities over there.

I think what has thrown the members of this committee off is Gen. Bedell Smith. Bedell Smith has come here and sold them a bill of goods. He said that the Voice of America broadcast was being heard by 50,000,000 Russians. I will bet you he never got out of the Embassy grounds in Moscow. There is no way in which he or anybody else can know how many short-wave radios there are in Russia or how many radios there are in Russia or how many people listen to radio programs. They do not have any Hooper rating system in Soviet-dominated countries or Russia. I will bet you further that if he ever did get out of the Embassy grounds that he was taken around or followed by an agent of the NKVD—a Russian agent was right there with him all the time. I do not believe that Bedell Smith was allowed to go through Russia and be accorded any more freedom of observation than was accorded to Wendell Willkie, Eric Johnston, and Mr. White and each of them had an NKVD agent on his trail all the time. They were shown what the NKVD wanted them to see, and nothing else.

My good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], was not scared when we debated the Greek-Turkish loan. He was not scared then about Communist aggression in the world and he is not scared now. He told us then that communism was on the wane in Europe, but I asked him what has happened in Hungary within the last week? You know what has happened there. The Communists had a gun at the head of the Prime Minister there. They were going

to shoot his child if he did not abdicate. So he abdicated and fled from his country and the Communists took over.

Now, let us not, for God's sake, come in here in our enthusiasm over one aspect of the Voice of America program and put ourselves in a position where we get a lot of Pinks and Reds foisted off onto us under some exchange program. Let us wait 3 or 4 years until things have had time to settle down, until world affairs have straightened out. Then if conditions have improved and things are different I may be for such a program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman believe that it would be of any benefit to America to send to Russia the type of American student who would want to go to Russia and stay there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Certainly not.

I said the other day that it was useless to think we could influence people in Europe by sending a handful of students over there under the exchange program. I told you the other day that during the war we had many ambassadors of good will. We had two or three million ambassadors of good will over there, our own GI's.

I say to you that the people of France, the people of Belgium, the people of Luxembourg, the people of Germany and the Soviet zone in Berlin know our GI's, and they were a good cross-section of America. So if anybody on earth can tell me what better ambassadors of good will we could have, and if they think that a handful of two or three hundred students can have greater influence than our soldiers, if they think that striped-pants cookie-pushers that the State Department sends over there can do more good than 2,000,000 boys, they are crazy. I said to you the other day that the GI's made love to their girls, that they broke their windows, but the good things they did more than offset the bad. So they know us as we are—warts and all.

What influence would 300 or 400 students be? Those people already know about this country, how great it is, how wealthy it is, its aims and purposes. And as far as Bedell Smith is concerned, as I said a while ago, I doubt if he ever got beyond the grounds of the American Embassy; and if he did, he was followed by some NKVD agent or was in the care of some NKVD agent. You know in all these countries over there, France and others, with their ministers and officials, prefects and sous-prefects—they wine and dine our Ambassadors—I have seen all of them; I know how they work and what they are—and I also know our Ambassadors rarely ever have the opportunity to see and understand the common people of those countries as I did—to send a few students over there would be of no effect. I know how the Communists work.

Strike this thing out. Let the voice of America be heard here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, under ordinary circumstances I would be entirely in accord with many of the ideas that the proponents of this legislation want to get across.

I would like to take a little time to talk about Radio Luxemburg.

During the war the American ground forces took over Radio Luxemburg, one of the strongest, if not the strongest, radio station in Europe, and used it most effectively for propaganda and psychological warfare. It was a magnificent job. The whole project was organized, directed, and operated by then colonel, now general, Clifford R. Powell.

I am proud of the job which was done by him because he is an American. I am prouder because he is a constituent of mine. I am still prouder because he was the commanding general of the division in which I was an officer when it was mustered into the Federal service, and because he has been for many years my close personal friend.

General Powell is a great statesman in his own right, besides being a great soldier. If we had had real Americans like General Powell operating this Voice of America originally, the character of that program would not have been such as to have caused the criticism which has been justly heaped upon it.

But we are not voting for ideas, under ordinary circumstances. We are voting for this specific legislation, under extraordinary conditions.

In section 203, as amended, you will see that the Secretary of State is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, but nothing that is not in keeping with the established foreign policy of the United States. In title V, section 501, the same idea is carried out in regard to the movies and radio.

What is the established foreign policy of the United States? In the first place, I will tell you one thing that will be the established foreign policy if you pass this bill. You will be bringing foreign students over here to our own universities at \$10 a day, or \$300 a month, for subsistence, when our own GI's get only \$65 a month. So you will be establishing the foreign rate of exchange of personnel at the rate of five to one—one foreigner equals five good American veterans. That is one of the things you will be establishing as a foreign policy. You will not need to sell that one to people in foreign countries. They will grab it. But you better sell it to American veterans first. But why bother? The American veteran is only the hometown boy who saved America. He is no exotic and fascinating stranger.

What about Russian communism? Is that our enemy or is it not? If it is not, then there is no sense in the March 12 address of the President or that popular legislation we passed called the Greek-Turk loan, or the many anti-Communist speeches made on the floor of this House or the anti-Communist legislation which has been passed. Of course, it is our enemy. Even the President admits it is our enemy in every part of the world—except in the United States, where it is only a bugaboo.

What have we done about it and what are we going to do about it?

We gave this enemy \$11,000,000,000 in lend-lease during the war so it could look strong. Still fearing we might be criticized for picking on an enemy weaker than ourselves, we have given it \$6,000,000,000 more since that time. Still being afraid we might be accused of bullying, we have appeased it, and have given it about everything it wanted to strengthen and spread itself. We are still doing it. Only a week ago a constituent told me his firm could not get steel piping. Yet, he said, two shiploads left this country under the Russian flag. We have stood around and wrung our hands while this enemy turned Europe into the chaos that is there now, upon which its own filthy philosophy can feed.

On last Thursday, the day before the House began debate on this measure, the other body ratified several treaties. I am not criticizing the other body. That is its responsibility. But I must point these things out to you as being some true facts of life so far as our foreign policy is concerned.

In the treaty with Italy you will find the following:

Italy shall pay the Soviet Union reparations in the amount of \$100,000,000 during a period of 7 years from the coming into force of the present treaty.

Now, listen to this: Section 2 (a), same article, provides that reparations shall be made from "a share of the Italian factory and tool equipment designed for the manufacture of war material."

The same thing applies to reparations to be given to Yugoslavia, only it is \$125,000,000 taken from the same source. Now, there is something it will take more than a persuasive radio voice or a picture with glamorous movie stars to sell to the Italian people and to convince them what a wonderful nation the United States is.

In the Hungarian treaty there are \$200,000,000 that are supposed to be paid to Soviet Russia and \$100,000,000 to be equally divided between Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Chairman, that is the foreign policy that this bill is designed to sell the world on, to teach the world about, by broadcasting and movies to make them love us. How can I vote to sell these things abroad when I cannot conscientiously try to sell them to our own people?

We are told that this bill is designed to sell America to the rest of the world. Well, that would be a change, at least. Up to date we have been giving it away.

Mr. Chairman, I want no part in voting the taxpayers' money to support, sell, and broadcast a two-headed, double-faced, reversible foreign policy of that character.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this administration had better decide on going in one direction so far as foreign policy is concerned; it better pick out that direction and it better get started in that direction—quick.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rich].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is the third day we have heard the Voice of America on the floor of this House. We have heard many Members speak for it and many speak against it. But, they were unfortunate enough to bring this bill up on this the third day of debate on Friday the 13th. Think of it. Friday, the 13th, is the day that they bring up this bill and try to conclude it. It would be the unlucky bill. Well, more people in this country are skeptical of Friday, the 13th, I think, than probably any other particular day in the year. Then you hear of the black cats going across the road, and some people are afraid of that.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Would the gentleman be for this bill if it were brought up on the 14th?

Mr. RICH. No; I would not be for it, especially at this time. I would not be for this bill, and I will tell you why. This bill is brought in here in the guise of Republican legislation, but it is only the continuation of the New Deal, and I was against everything that the New Deal tried to bring upon this country in the way of regimentation and regulation, and we are finding out now more than ever, each and every day, just how terribly bad it has been for the American people, and I want no part in it. I do not know why our Members have been so gullible as to swallow this legislation, hook, line, and sinker. I cannot understand it. I have the highest regard for the Republican and Democratic Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I cannot understand what they are trying to do in furthering this legislation, in furthering the thing that the State Department has been trying to do with this country in foreign governments to sell us down the river. They sold us down the river in everything they tried to do in the last 15 years, and if we do not watch out, the first thing we know we will have a weak, disrupt, wrecked Federal Government in America, and we are not going to be able to help anybody, any place, anywhere, any time. We have wrecked our own Nation in trying to do that which the New Deal has been recommending that we should do in foreign lands.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the activities of the State Department which will be financed by this bill.

Sovereign states object to outside interference. The war has not changed that age-old principle, which most of our career diplomats adhere to.

Sponsors of this measure say that it is only \$15,000,000 that is required. That will pay interest on a large amount of war debt. Once embarked on this program, it will last as long as the national debt, and, like all bureaucracies, it largely duplicates the work of the regular Foreign Service officers and of the already established Intelligence Service of the State Department. Sponsors support this measure by reference to illustrations where it is already functioning without congressional authority. In Yugoslavia they—MUNDT—saw block-

long lines of natives waiting to view a cultural exhibit and a movie. Under dictatorships, no man can enter without official approval, which is not freely given where opponents of such officials seek to enlighten such natives—not in a police state anywhere.

Propaganda is a dangerous weapon. This measure affords no practical means of safely propagandizing foreigners. Language, custom, and mechanics bar the effectiveness of this measure. Who can be reached by our propaganda? How many short-wave radios are there in this country? Who would risk our propaganda libraries and movies, or read a "kept" newspaper in a political state?

To reach western Russia and eastern Europe we have to maintain a radio station in Munich, Germany. How long will we be there? The Moscow fiasco requires a separate peace which politically wise men in the State Department will bring about within 12 months. Treaty drafts were discussed at London and at Moscow. The lines of cleavage have been disclosed and points of disagreement as between the Allies have been fully explored. These points of disagreement will be separately negotiated with Austria and Germany, notwithstanding military objections reported in a recent issue of the New York Times. These military men in political jobs in Germany and Austria want to hold onto them. The American people do not want to pay the cost of supporting them in their jobs, and at the same time pay the cost of supporting relief for these peoples.

Returned travelers from Austria and Germany tell me that these peoples want to be left alone, to work out their own recovery, as they have done for centuries, without military interference from within or without.

It takes a letter 2 weeks to travel 100 miles through military channels from Vienna to Lintz by way of Sulzburg. Unemployed officers must check. No sound currency has been established by allied military authorities in the year and a half of our occupation. The Army does not want that job and cannot fill it. Only the conquered nations can bring about their own recovery from within. This bill thwarts and interferes with their recovery efforts. This bill fosters and establishes a new controversial instrumentality with which they have to contend.

Obviously, the bill stirs up political and social controversy in areas first needing recovery. Not all peoples want our political and social system. Our attempts to invade this sovereign privacy will have adverse repercussions upon us. Many of these peoples think that we want to swing our weight around like a sailor on shore leave.

Under our social system, industry seeks its own markets and brings to foreigners the benefits of our skills and abilities when and where foreigners want it. To hold out an empty picture as provided in this bill thwarts the very objective of the measure.

England and Russia may continue to propagandize as this measure provides, but neither of them, at the moment, seems to be maintaining successfully their own houses in order. Many a GI and discharged Government worker here

would like to get for study \$10 a day—as this bill provides we shall pay foreign students. A good many GI's would work without study for \$300 a month.

These foreigners want work and not propaganda. A writer in Birmingham, England, reports in the New York Times, on March 15, 1947:

With reference to productive efficiency, in 1936 outputs of coal per man-shift were:

	Hundred-weight
Germany.....	33
Poland.....	40
Holland.....	35
United States of America.....	100
United Kingdom.....	23

And the writer concludes:

If the miner attended his work with the same regularity as in 1939 and exerted the same physical effort while at work, the national (United Kingdom) output of coal would be increased by no less than 50,000,000 tons per annum.

Loss of coal exports represents the value of our (United Kingdom) imports; steel production is also curtailed; chemical exports are affected to the extent of £2,500,000 per annum due to shortage of coal supplies.

Culture and information—my eye.

Now, the gentleman from Oklahoma a few minutes ago said that we should stop discussing this bill now and wait a year or two until we see how General Marshall cleans up the State Department, and then if you bring this bill up we might try to have the Voice of America go to all the countries of the world and tell them what America means. I agree with that statement. But, under the turmoil that exists in the world today, gentlemen, I do not believe you can do a thing. Then again, you are going to ask from thirty to eighty million of good, hard, American taxpayers' money to be spent on this propaganda? I would not waste my taxpayer's money in this manner. It seems to me that if General Marshall had \$1,000,000—not \$80,000,000—\$1,000,000 and employed 8 or 10 good, high-calibered men, and let them go out and broadcast some things about America and do something that would tell the foreign nations just what we are trying to do, it would not be so bad, but that these foreign countries think today that all we can do is to buy. Buy all countries of the world—a poor way to gain friends. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves for trying to buy our neighbors. It will never work. We ought to be ashamed of the things we are doing by going out and visiting these countries and then offering them everything they want in gifts—one hundred million, three hundred million, forty-three hundred million—where will you get this money? In the last 10 years we have been going to these foreign nations, and every time they ask for \$50,000,000, \$100,000,000 or three or four hundred million, we have a lot of fellows here in this country that say, "Pass out the money." Uncle Sam has lots of it. And they come to us for these gifts and get them. We are only suckers.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Does not the gentleman feel that instead of spending \$30,000,000 in this way, that if we want to help Europe we should provide them with tractors and harvesters and other machinery, since we are called upon to feed the world, to make them self-sufficient and feed themselves? Would not those harvesters and tractors be far more of value to all of us and to them than some books and radio broadcasts?

Mr. RICH. I tell you that if a man is hungry and he gets a loaf of bread, it is worth a whole lot more to his system than to feed him a lot of hot air. Bread will take care of the inward man and prevent starvation and gain a friend. Words are many times dangerous and many times do more harm than good; words many times are more dangerous than one realizes. So, Mr. Speaker, until we get our country settled and happy within our own midst, let us not assume the responsibility of trying to change the manners, customs, traditions, of all the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa. We might lose more friends than we can make.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE TEACHING

SEC. 204. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the development and demonstration of better methods for teaching the English language abroad.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to approach this from a little different angle this time. There has been much said here about the question of education, the exchange of students, and the exchange of professors. I have had quite a long acquaintance with the educational systems of this country and the type of boys and girls they are turning out. I can remember the day when the professors who taught government in our great colleges specialized in emphasizing the beautiful philosophy behind our government and our system of government. They were familiar with it. I want to give you an example of the reaction that that type of teaching had upon our boys.

I knew a splendid fellow. He was an unusual athlete, very popular, a red-blooded fellow. He graduated with honors in the natural course of events. He entered the employment of a large corporation in Canada. He was killed in the service. His people were very poor. He had been sending what he earned down to his poor people. He had worked his way through the university. As soon as his death was announced, his fraternity brothers went up there to see if he left anything that they could take to his old people down in Pennsylvania. They searched, and there was nothing in his little hall bedroom except one priceless document, written in his own handwriting, entitled "My Guide." I read it to you:

To respect my country, my profession and myself. To be honest and fair with my fellow men as I expect them to be honest and square with me. To be a loyal citizen of the United States of America. To speak of it with praise and to act always as a trustworthy custodian of its good name. To be a man whose name carries weight with it

wherever it goes. To remember that success lies within myself, in my own brain, my own ambition, my own courage and determination. To expect difficulties and to force my way through them; to turn hard experience into capital for future struggles. To steer clear of dissipation and guard my health of body and peace of mind as a most precious stock in trade. Finally, to take a good trip on the joys of life, to play the game like a man; to fight against nothing so hard as my own weakness and to grow in strength a gentleman, a Christian.

He was not taught by an exchange professor unfamiliar with the fundamentals of our Government, he was taught by the good old solid rock of Americanism, the type of man who is turning out just that type of boy. The professor that comes in from abroad is not grounded in the philosophy of our Government as our men here are, reared and taught and trained as teachers should be in this country. There has been too much loose teaching of the subject of government. There is one thing that alarms me very much about this whole proposal here, and that is, in regard to what we are going to sell abroad. I was perfectly astounded, and I am not criticizing Representative MUNDT personally, but I was perfectly astounded, as I think every Member who was on the floor must have been when these terrible exhibits were presented here which we were told by the chairman of the subcommittee that we were going to sell the bad features as well as the good features of the United States. I am sure that such a philosophy did not come from the chairman of the subcommittee; that came from somebody in the State Department. Exhibits to prove what they intended to do if the bill should become law.

Would it not be a wonderful thing to hear somebody bellowing over the radio, and we will have no control of it after this becomes law, "My comrades abroad: I want to tell you about our judicial system in the United States. I want to tell you about our courts, where the humblest person can get justice.

"But, of course, even though the humblest person can get justice, we also have another system. We have a system where in certain sections of the country if they want to do justice and mercy to a man they suspect of having committed the crime, they hang him or lynch him. We just use a rope. You use a firing squad, but we just use a rope and hang the man from the limb of a tree."

That is the sort of thing that goes out. There is the good and there is the bad. Then the next night:

"Fellow comrades of the world: The Voice of America is speaking to you. I want to tell you about the wonderful purity of our election system. That is why we are urging it upon you people abroad. That is why we send inspectors over there to see that you get a fair deal and that there is no bribery, fraud, or coercion in your elections. But we have another side to the story. We have the Pendergast system. We have a system which we find out in one of our great Western States, especially in the city of Kansas City, in Missouri. Anybody who wants to listen to us, that is our other system. We protect the people who vote,

We put the ballots after the people have voted in a sealed receptacle of solid steel and lock the box. So, if there is any irregularity which comes up later, the officials can then examine the ballots.

"But we want to tell you something that happened in America. Two thugs, after a number of men had been indicted for fraud in the elections, thinking that the box contained lollipops pried the box open and destroyed the evidence so that the men could not be convicted."

And so the bad and the good Voice of America will continue day after day and night after night.

Gentlemen, there is not a system of salesmanship in the world that can sell the good article by stressing the bad features of it.

The greatest sales manager in the United States prior to his retirement was William Holler, affectionately known as Bill Holler. Do you imagine he or his salesmen or dealers stressed the bad features of the Chevrolet cars and trucks? Look at his record of sales based not on the bad qualities of the Chevrolet cars, but their good qualities.

Bill Holler has been responsible for Chevrolet leadership in sales in 9 out of the last 10 car-production years.

In peacetime his vast and closely knit retail organization sells over \$1,500,000,000 worth of merchandise a year.

In the 12 years of his administration he has been head of a sales and service organization employing over 90,000 people.

In these years his sales strategy has sold more than 22,000,000 automobiles—7,500,000 new cars and trucks and 14,500,000 used vehicles. This is the equivalent of almost four-fifths of all cars and trucks on the road at the present time.

He is credited with selling 50 percent of all cars and trucks produced by Chevrolet since it first began business in 1912.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, whether we like it or not, psychological programs as a part of our foreign and national policy in peace and in war are here to stay. If you have any doubt on that subject, consult the General Staff of the War Department. If you have any doubt on that subject, ascertain the extent of the operations of the Psychological Warfare Branch in World War II.

The man who recognized and identified psychological aggression at the San Francisco Conference more than any other man in the world was Herbert Hoover. He sought to have written into the Charter some provisions on that subject, but he failed to succeed. We have a responsibility to roll back not only the falsehoods and misleading things about this Nation that get abroad in the world, but to develop some good will by the interchange of students, the interchange of information, the interchange of books, and all that sort of thing.

I intend to vote for a program. I saw its effect in 1945. I came back from overseas the day that the Committee on Appropriations was marking up the war agencies bill. The committee at the time was considering the appropriation for the Office of War Information. They asked

for \$35,000,000. I suggested that we give it to them, notwithstanding the fact that there was much criticism of Elmer Davis, who was then director of the OWI. I was not too familiar with what was being done on the domestic front, but I did know what my senses perceived when I was abroad and I saw the excellent character of work being done and how effective it was.

This proposed cultural and informational policy, then, is in the nature of an extension of a function that began in wartime.

I share some of the apprehensions of a good many Members of the House of Representatives as to the type of personnel that will be devoted to this work. I am confident that General Marshall if given the time will take care of that. The FBI is investigating every person in the State Department right now. If you have any doubt about General Marshall, let me give you one footnote to history. Perhaps I should not disclose it, but yet I think it is interesting.

I recall the day when the Committee on Appropriations met in secret session with the General Staff in the War Department, and I remember the day in response to a question by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. EWING THOMASON], that General Marshall, at a time when there was so much anxiety and concern in the country, said, "If the Japanese should elect to take Alaska at this particular period, it may be necessary for us to let them have it. Just now, first things must come first."

Here is the man upon whom we pinned our every hope when the Nation was in jeopardy. Is it fair now to come into this well and to assail his patriotism and make it appear that, wittingly or unwittingly, this great patriot, upon whose shoulders we reposed the very welfare and perpetuity of this Republic, should now have such a change of heart that he would sell it down the river? Oh, for shame!

Now, of course, people get into the State Department whose loyalty is in question. Of course there is some doubt, oftentimes, about the nature of the program. I share something of that apprehension. That is why, at the proper time, I propose to offer an amendment. I hope and I believe that the committee will probably take it, because I have been discussing it with them. It proposes the creation of a 10-man commission, including the Secretary of State. It will be a bipartisan commission. It must be confirmed by the Senate. Let me say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that since we have a majority in the Senate, if we cannot get good circumspect, competent people on that commission, it will be our fault in a Republican Senate. Among those men there must be one who has served in World War II. There must be one who has had motion picture experience. There must be one from the newspaper industry. There must be one from the radio industry. There must be a labor representative. There must be three who represent business. It would be a bipartisan commission. In the very first section of this amendment it provides that they shall formulate the policies to be followed and

adhered to in connection with the exchange of persons, knowledge, skills, and the assignment of specialists to carry out all the other provisions of this act.

I want to vote for this bill, and if we have a commission of that kind that will formulate the policies that must be adhered to, then the only responsibility that the State Department has is to serve as an operating and administering agency, and to take the policies that have been formulated by the commission appointed by the President and confirmed by the United States Senate, and surely we should be able to have some confidence in the capacity of a commission of that kind.

At the proper time I shall offer that amendment and I trust it will commend itself to your good graces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second time I have risen to address this Congress. I have a deep conviction that this Congress today is discussing a bill which goes much further than the question of the Voice of America. As this debate progresses the provisions of the pending bill unfold in their true light. The body of the bill is broad and comprehensive. The caption of the pending bill certainly gives no indication of the many provisions contained in the body of the proposed legislation. The Voice of America is not represented in the present bill under consideration since that could be done only by the voice of 140,000,000 American people. I am disturbed that we should be called upon to enact into law the present legislation in view of the critical world situation.

Now that time has passed we are beginning to see the operation of the recent Greek-Turkey gift. A tricky clause was hidden in that legislation which gives the State Department together with the President the right to freeze materials, and to take any materials from the veterans of this country or from the farmers or any other group of the American population, any material deemed necessary for the completion of the Greek-Turkey gift. Our people are already beginning to suffer from the effects of the heavy drain upon the supplies and resources of this country.

What is there in this bill? In the first place, it is a blank check. There is no limitation upon the amount of money that this program could cost. Legislation so broad may lead to waste and wholesale spending of the taxpayers' money. It provides for the establishment and maintenance of schools across the seas, and for the staffing of these schools. It provides for the erection of installations and for the establishing of such institutions and facilities as are necessary to carry out the far-flung provisions of the pending bill. Technicians, engineers, and all other necessary personnel may visit foreign lands and engage in the construction of public works under the provisions of the pending bill. These agents may enter into contracts with foreign governments for a period of

10 years. These contracts may deal with leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States. It is difficult to conceive of a situation that would grant such unlimited power and authority. Possibly in the consideration of this measure we have overlooked many tricky provisions that are contained in the 21-page bill. There is a provision to establish and maintain in the United States reception centers for foreign students and for visitors. All of these provisions will be paid for by American tax dollars. The Government of the United States does not provide entertainment at the expense of the taxpayers for the college students in our own country. These students, teachers, trainees, and professors who are authorized to come to this country are to be entertained and their expenses paid for by the American taxpayers. The pending bill provides that the above students and experts coming into our country shall have their transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem subsistence and other expenses paid. This is shocking to the good judgment of our people. The \$10 per diem is far in excess of what we pay our own Government employees in our own country.

The above provisions are alarming when reports indicate that there are already as many as 17,000 foreign students studying here in America in our colleges and universities. Many young men who wore the American uniform with honor in the defense of this Republic cannot enroll in college or university because of overcrowded conditions. Experience has taught us that before World War II Hitler sent students and professors into other countries and thereby gained information and prepared the way for a later invasion. Under this bill we throw open the gates for thousands to come to our shores upon the representation that they are students. This Government has voted billions of dollars to prevent the spread of communism throughout the world and my prediction is we will be called upon to vote more money for that purpose. I cannot see how we are now justified in supporting the pending bill which has no limitation upon the number, nationality, or section of the world from which these students and Communist agents, slick-tongued, and smooth commentators may come to this land for no other purpose than to propagandize and attempt to change the minds of American youth. Experience has taught us that under our present deportation laws it is almost impossible to deport individuals when they once come to this country. For that reason, I am of the opinion that we should move slowly and proceed with caution. By this legislation we are moving out into a broad and uncharted sea. This bill covers practically every conceivable subject except the Voice of America.

I could never face the people of my congressional district or the people of America and explain to the good women of this country why I would vote for a bill to furnish liquor paid for by American taxpayers to support and entertain delegations and student groups from other countries who would be permitted to come to America under this bill. Un-

der the very provisions of the pending bill the Secretary of State is authorized to delegate to other officers of the Government the power and authority to maintain and carry out the program undertaken by this act. The above provision means that the Secretary of State would have little or no supervision over the administration of this program. I shall vote against this pending bill for the reasons heretofore stated because I do not believe that it is in the interest of America. If a proper bill providing for a clearly defined and regulated American radio program should be brought before this Congress based upon the spreading of the truth about America I should be delighted to support the same. I feel that many Members of Congress share the same view.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 4, line 23, strike out all of line 23 and all of section 204.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments conclude in 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have been privileged to hear every word of debate on this pending bill and I have not heretofore taken any time to discuss it. Like most of those to whom I am privileged to speak this afternoon I should like to vote for a bill that would carry out the spirit and purpose of the Voice of America as that voice has been described to the people of America by its proponents. Therefore, along with other Members of Congress I expect to offer a number of amendments to this pending bill that will attempt as best we can on the floor of Congress, to improve this legislation so that it may at least try to carry out the purpose that its authors have told the people in America is intended.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered a simple amendment to strike out section 204. Section 204 says the Secretary is authorized to provide for the development and demonstration of better methods of teaching the English language abroad. We have an Office of Education in America. The Commissioner of Education, Mr. Studebaker, and his representatives have been abroad trying to develop a plan of education. I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee of Appropriations that handles the appropriation for the Office of Education. Is there any reason in God's world why in this legislation we should set up the broad power in the office of the Secretary of State to develop and demonstrate better methods of teaching English abroad? If they had in here the development of better meth-

ods of teaching and demonstrating English in America I, perhaps, would be for it. But why we are turning that job over to the State Department is beyond me.

The authors of this bill will say: "Oh, well, the State Department has the power to utilize the services under this bill of any other agency of Government." Well, they have that power if they so see fit to use it, but so far as I am concerned I want any power in the field of education to remain with the Office of Education. I may say to my distinguished friend, the author of this bill, that I cannot support it unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, this amendment and a number of other amendments to strike out large and sundry portions of this bill, are agreed to. I am certain that a majority of the membership of this House will not support this bill in its present form.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Upon assurance that the Office of Education has the authority to make these English demonstrations abroad, we have no objection to striking out this section.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would the gentleman from South Dakota object to widening this so as to teach English to some of these economists down here in the departments who have come here during the last 10 years?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, we should confine ourselves as much as possible to this bill and discuss it section by section and if it is not possible to improve the bill, and if we cannot, then we should vote to send this bill back to the committee. Let us have it rewritten and have that committee bring back a bill here that will carry out the spirit and purpose of what we have in mind. That is the only fair, decent thing to do and the only way we can be fair to the people of America. We should discuss this bill section by section and let the people of America and let the Members of this Congress know what is in the bill. There are a lot of people who do not even know what is in this bill and will not when we get through. If we discuss it section by section, perhaps we can write a pretty good bill right here on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If the committee has had this bill under consideration for 2 years, and have been unable to improve it, how in the name of goodness are we going to write it on the floor of the House in a matter of 2 or 3 days? We will, in all probability, get it more confused than it now is, if that be possible.

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is right. It appears as the debate upon this bill proceeds that the large number of men who have spoken in opposition to it would have no objection to taking a bill which would provide for a sane and sensible Voice of America. I should not oppose such a bill if someone could devise it, but even so, I doubt very much if even a gentleman with the eloquence of our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. EVERETT DIRKSEN, who is one of the most persuasive debaters who speaks to this House, could win an argument with Soviet Russia in a radio broadcasting program of any length whatsoever. There are not enough radios in Russia to begin with, and, moreover, the convictions which he has with respect to America and the convictions which Soviet Russia has with respect to America are so divergent that it would be the voices of two nations wasted upon thin air, and the money which sponsored them would be wasted. We should not waste any of our money. Is it not rather paradoxical that this Nation has spent more than \$12,000,000,000 of its money in Europe since VJ-day and that now there are those who advocate to the American people and to this Congress that we must hereafter spend \$31,000,000 more annually for the State Department to tell them that we have spent that amount of money and what we have spent it for? Is it not paradoxical that this Congress provided \$750,000,000 to feed the needy people of Greece, and incidentally to help sustain an army in Turkey, and then consider spending \$31,000,000 more or some other sum to tell those people to whom we are sending that money that it is our Government and our money that is providing the relief? What kind of thing are we undertaking to put over on the American people?

Only yesterday or the day before I noted in a local newspaper the results of the Gallup poll on the Voice of America. The uninitiated and the innocent and those who know nothing about the provisions of this bill believe that this covers it. Here is what it says:

Sentiment found about 50-50 on United States broadcasts to Russia.

Is there anything in this bill that would limit broadcasts to Russia? They polled the American people, and this is the question that was asked:

Do you think our Government should spend money for radio broadcasts to the Russian people—giving them an honest picture of America and of our Government's policies?

Few people, at first blush, find any fault with that if they feel we can spare the money, but this bill goes far beyond that. It provides for many other things. No sponsor of the bill has ever explained to my satisfaction what the true purposes of it are. They seem to me to be anything approved by the Secretary of State.

Under the terms, Congress is being asked to give this same State Department, not only authority to broadcast its programs, but to grant to the Secretary of State the authority to bring persons from other countries, including students and professors, to the United States, and

to send our citizens abroad, without limit as to number, all expenses to be paid by our Government.

It authorizes the exchange of literature and translations with other countries, without limit, and at our expense.

It authorizes the Secretary of State to provide assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, without limit, and at our expense.

It authorizes him to develop and demonstrate better methods for teaching the English language abroad and at our expense.

If any other country should want any of our citizens who are trained in scientific, technical, or professional fields, whether or not these persons are employed by our own Government, the Secretary is authorized to assign them for duty in the country requesting their services—and at our expense. The only restriction is that they cannot help any foreign country train or equip its armed forces.

The bill goes so far as to permit any person assigned to a foreign country to accept an office in that country's government, to perform official functions, and in all respects to become an officer of such foreign government—but, again, all at the expense of the United States.

That is not all. The Secretary of State is authorized, by the terms of the bill, to draw upon all other departments and agencies of our Government for personnel, technicians, and others, and to use the services and facilities of any other Government agency to carry out this super good-will program. With the agency's consent, these people can be sent abroad, or used as escorts for groups of persons from other countries to be brought here to travel throughout the United States. Our Government will pay all traveling expenses of the foreign visitors, plus the salaries and the expenses of the escorts.

What a haven this bill would provide for all the Government employees forced out as we abandon the New Deal and wartime bureaus.

The bill even authorizes the Secretary of State "to provide for and pay the expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with furthering the purposes of this act." There is no limit as to the number of persons who might attend, no limit on the number of conventions, and they may be held any place in the world. There are a great many societies in this country, and not all of them wholly friendly to democratic processes, who not only would happily accept this opportunity to meet at Government expense, but who would put pressure on the Department to finance their conventions in foreign countries.

And even this is not all. The bill gives the Secretary and all personnel who are to be engaged in this strange pursuit of selling America to the world, the authority to furnish "official entertainment necessary for the purposes of the act."

I wonder how many American people have any idea of what this bill the State Department is asking actually provides. The press refers to it as the Voice of America program. A Nation-wide poll conducted by the American Institute of

Public Opinion asked the people this question: "Do you think our Government should spend money for radio broadcasts to the Russian people, giving them an honest picture of America and of our Government's policies?" I wonder if Mr. George Gallup, who conducted the poll, or any of his associates, ever read this so-called Voice of America bill.

Only 1 page and 3 lines of the 21-page bill deal with the broadcasting of radio programs to other countries. There are 20 pages of provisions, such as I have mentioned, yet its sponsors refer to it as authorizing the Voice of America.

It is far more than that. One Congressman remarked in debate on the House floor, "This bill is the largest, most far-reaching blank check for power and money that has ever been before this House."

I cannot approve the spending of unlimited amounts for a program as broad, as vague, and impractical as the one suggested by the State Department.

They ask that we pay for people from other countries to travel in the United States. These sightseeing jaunts around our scenic country at the Government's expense might be very pleasant, but I think you agree that this pleasure hardly is justified at the expense of our already overburdened taxpayers.

And we are to pay for official entertainment—another very elastic phrase. Does it mean we pay for champagne—or vodka if the representatives of the program ever get inside Russia? Or if they visited the Missouri Ozarks, maybe the official entertainment would include sampling some of our corn liquor. In view of the stories that come back from international meetings and diplomatic functions, we would be naive to expect that the unlimited funds requested for official entertainment are not intended to provide an ample supply of spirits.

Just how much this whole idealistic scheme eventually would cost the Government is not mentioned in the bill. But the bill merely authorizes appropriations to carry out its purposes. If the \$31,000,000 estimated to be required annually proves to be inadequate, then you can rest assured Congress will be expected to agree to the spending of untold millions more.

Since VJ-day, the United States has spent more than \$12,000,000,000 for relief in Europe alone. Is there any logic in a policy that says we will give the needy countries of the world the food, clothes, and equipment that they need so desperately, and then spend millions more to tell them who provided the relief? Must we pay the salaries of countless administrators of our \$750,000,000 program of aid to Greece and Turkey, and then spend millions more to inform the people of those countries what those administrators are doing and whom they represent?

We are the only country in the world that is giving away anything. If these gifts do not sound a louder Voice of America than endless radio broadcasts, then we would better spend the extra money properly training the personnel of the Foreign Service and the administrators of our relief programs.

America needs no selling program. Millions would like to enter our country now if our immigration laws did not keep them out. It is known all over the world as the land of freedom and opportunity.

I feel, as I know other Americans do, deep injustice, if the very countries to which we are handing money and food and clothing are being flooded with information that attempts to discredit our country. But opening our own floodgates of propaganda will not stop this. No sensible citizen in this country today believes that we can engage to our advantage in a short-wave debate with Russia, or that anything we say over the radio will have any effect on the Russian program of aggression.

In fact there is no proof that the Voice of America broadcasts reach any significant number of listeners in Europe. Eighteen countries send radio broadcasts our way, with a total of about 37 program hours daily. Yet how many of these programs have you heard? If they have any effect on the opinions of the average American, I have yet to discover it. There is far less chance that our programs are heard by a worth-while number of people in foreign countries.

By their votes in the last election, the American people indicated they want to curb our Nation's reckless spending, and to limit the power of bureaucracy. They said then that they are not in favor of blank checks and unlimited power to any department of government.

I hope the true voice of America will be heard again, and in the Congress, before this bill becomes a law.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, an influential member of this body remarked to me just a moment ago, "Don't you think we are losing ground today? Don't you see that the committee is willing and ready to accept every amendment that is offered? They are willing to take anything that is offered. Any amendment that comes along, like the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, will be accepted. So will Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment. They will accept every amendment, just so they can pass the old Bloom bill, renamed the Mundt bill." They did not fare so well 2 years ago with the Republican side.

Mr. VORYS. The bill passed by a two-thirds majority.

Mr. BENDER. Today the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to General Marshall in glowing terms, and I share his views of General Marshall. However, General Marshall is not infallible. General Marshall has made some mistakes, some very glaring mistakes. Any man in his position would make mistakes. He is not before us. He is not part of this bill.

Another gentleman's name was brought into the discussion, Herbert Hoover. I have observed in recent months that Herbert Hoover is in good standing again, even among Democratic Members of this House. Lauding Herbert Hoover was not so popular 3, 4, 6, or 8 years ago, but now they are paying great and glowing tributes to him. However, Herbert Hoover has not said anything about this bill. As a matter of

fact, I think he is most apprehensive about the whole business, if the truth were to be known.

The gentleman who just preceded me referred to \$12,000,000,000 having been spent in Europe since VJ-day. I am appealing to your common sense. If \$12,000,000,000 would not change Europe's attitude what in the world will \$31,000,000 do? As a Republican I was elected on an economy program, and as a member of the Committee on Public Works I know that our committee has frowned on all public works because of economy.

As I see it, all we are doing with this \$31,000,000 is throwing it down a rat hole. No good will come from it. Sure, some boondoggling in Europe will be carried on. Of course, we will have radio broadcasts and publications, but who will read them and who will listen to them? If \$12,000,000,000 spent in Europe since VJ-day will not change the hearts of these people as far as the United States of America is concerned, what will \$31,000,000 do? As the gentleman from Oklahoma pointed out, 3,000,000 men went overseas, and billions of dollars were spent—\$400,000,000,000—to sell America, to sell the heart of America. If that has not sold America, what great miracles will be wrought with this \$31,000,000 boondoggle?

The world will think well of us or ill of us, depending entirely upon one thing—what we do. Perhaps sometimes we should remember the Scripture—"By their fruits ye shall know them."

By our actions we will be known—by what we do, not by what we say; not by what some radio commentator or jazz band or comedian or entertainer or some State Department bureaucrat may say. Not what we say, but what we do—this is what will gain us friendship.

Throughout modern history, tides of immigration have brought new life, new skills, and new people to build our Nation into its present greatness. For more than a hundred years liberty-loving peoples everywhere in the world have looked to the United States. More than this, whenever distress has occurred and disasters have occurred anywhere in the world, the record of the United States for generous aid has been without parallel. The plain people everywhere in the world have confidence in the American form of government, and expect us now in the present world crisis to behave in a democratic manner.

What we need is not a State Department broadcast program but a basic change in our whole foreign policy from one of military aggrandizement and military alliances and maintenance of enormous military forces. We need, Mr. Chairman, to retrace the steps which the Truman administration has taken us on the road to war. We need to come before the United Nations and present to them the problems confronting us in the building of peace. We need to advise with and work with all other nations in the world through the organization which can be the organized conscience of mankind; namely, the United Nations. And in that great forum, we need to give leadership. It is not pretty to hear Gen-

eral Marshall or President Truman talk and talk and talk about peace, and then send our bombers and our warships all over the world, or to hear them talk of peace and in the same breath demand universal military training and a thousand and one other wasteful military projects.

What we should do is come before the United Nations day after day after day with constructive, positive, affirmative proposals to assist in the reconstruction of the broken economies of the world and with proposals to maintain genuine democratic governments throughout the world.

The world hears us when we speak before the United Nations. The world hears us and sees what we do. Thirty millions of dollars wasted on poppycock will never hide the constant threats of war which pour from our present administration, nor will \$30,000,000 in jazz records hide the fact that military adventure and military alliances are the basic theme of the present administration's foreign policy.

The substance of our foreign policy is what we need to change, Mr. Chairman. By our deeds we shall be known.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the \$30,000,000 requested by the Voice of America is made in a spirit of fear. Some bright young man in the State Department bureaucracy believes that radio records and speeches can hide the substance of our present military foreign policy. Such a hope is sheer folly. Abraham Lincoln once said:

You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, our State Department should ponder those words. Thirty millions of dollars, three hundred millions of dollars, three billions of dollars spent on propaganda will not hide the fact from the people of America or from the people of the world that the present administration has launched this Nation on the path of war and on the path of unilateral military alliances with corrupt and reactionary governments everywhere on the globe.

This is the substance of the Truman foreign policy.

The blunt fact is, Mr. Chairman, that if we appropriate this \$30,000,000, we will have become an accessory to the foreign policy of the Truman administration which the people of this country are going to turn out of office in 1948. If we vote for this \$30,000,000, we will be voting for an endless number of similar projects all of which will be a complete waste of the taxpayers' money. The Congress of the United States as an equal branch of the United States Government has the power and responsibility to say "No" when the evidence is overwhelmingly against proposals of the executive department. This demand for \$30,000,000 exhibits once again the utter disregard for the interests of the American taxpayer which the administration daily exhibits.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BREHM moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, the motion speaks for itself. Let us decide whether we are going to take this or leave it. Let us not waste any more time on it. Let us make up our minds on it now. If this committee in two years time could not decide whether they had a good bill or not and are now accepting almost every amendment that is offered to it, then I question what possible chance there is for us to decide here on the floor of the House such an important issue. Let us send this bill back to the Foreign Affairs Committee. I believe the committee can write a bill now that they know the views of Congress, but surely this bill, as presented, is a monstrosity. I sincerely trust that we may be able to amend it so that I can support it, but in my opinion the committee should have done this before reporting it to the floor of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

I shall take no more time in asking you to reject the motion than was taken in asking you to accept it.

This is the third time that this sort of dilatory tactic has been engaged in. The committee has demonstrated by our actions our determination to do what we said at the beginning of the debate and to work with you to make this bill as effective as possible. This is not perfect legislation; no legislation really ever gets that good. We have worked on it a long time and any suggestions that you can make will gladly be considered in the light of our extensive study of the problems with which this legislation deals.

Some amendments have been rejected and some have been accepted. Many have been discussed with the subcommittee in advance. That is the constructive, American, congressional procedure. Neither our committee nor the Congress is infallible but our joint efforts usually produce legislation which is practical and sound.

It is a strange behavior, however, to try to condemn a committee of the House because it is willing to consult with the membership of Congress in trying to do the best possible job in meeting a specific problem. It is even stranger behavior when such criticism comes from those who even more violently criticize committees which try to ram their legislation on through the House without amendments of any kind.

I do agree with the gentleman from Ohio, however. Let us discontinue talking about vague issues. Let us meet the problems by reading the bill section by section so we can move forward to the completion of this bill.

I ask you, please, to reject the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BREHM) there were—ayes, 55, noes, 95.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not facilitate the procedure for all of us and not inconvenience anyone if I were to obtain unanimous consent to consider title III as read and that it and all other sections be open for amendment. Then, Members can offer amendments to specific sections, and each Member could talk on his own amendment and not run into the danger of any Member being prevented from speaking on any amendment that he wishes to speak on. I believe that would be a fair procedure.

I make that as a unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I object. I think this bill ought to be read word by word.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—ASSIGNMENT OF SPECIALISTS PERSONS TO BE ASSIGNED

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, when the government of another country is desirous of obtaining the services of a person having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications, from time to time to assign or authorize the assignment for service, to or in cooperation with such government, any person in the employ or service of the Government of the United States who has such qualifications, with the approval of the Government agency in which such person is employed or serving. Nothing in this act, however, shall authorize the assignment of officers or enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps for service relating to the organizations, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 15, strike out the words "or Marine Corps" and insert "Marine Corps, or Coast Guard."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on a limitation of the debate? I see two Members standing. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall probably not take 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, to put it mildly, I am of the opinion, with many Members, that this bill needs considerable overhauling. I have heard a lot of Members express themselves as to what was wrong with the bill, that this was wrong with it, that that was wrong with it, and suggesting amendments they thought might well be adopted. It reminds me of an experience I had as a boy on the farm. We had a neighbor who thought he was a great horse trader. One day he went out with a horse and brought back the most decrepit, sad-looking animal you ever saw, whereupon all the neighbors gathered around to advise him what should be done to make a horse out of this newly acquired creature. One said he should do this, someone else said, no, he should do that. Finally, an old fellow came along who really understood horses. They asked his opinion. He said: "My friend, there is only one thing that horse needs, and that is a darned good burial."

I would not go that far about this bill but I think recommitment would help the situation a great deal. This bill to my mind violates many principles which I thought had been firmly established in the American thinking. First, is it not rather violative of our policy of economy in Government spending? When the depression was on and we did not know quite what to do to solve it we ran hither and yon and we spent money first on one patent medicine and then on another. We have now abandoned that policy, I trust, and have returned to sound principles of economy and government. I am glad to note that the Appropriations Committee of this House is doing its full duty, is doing a great service to the country, in scrutinizing every request for every dollar that is appropriated for domestic purposes. We have trimmed down everything including Agriculture, in which I have a great and peculiar interest. We make some savings there and yet when any untried scheme that has to do with our foreign relations is brought in here, in the name of unity we think we are called upon to furnish whatever money they need, and we have poured millions of dollars down the rat holes of Europe and Asia. I think the people are getting a little restive, and look to the Republican Party to do its full duty in this matter. Of course, unity is a good thing. Unity is a great thing in support of any policy if that policy happens to be right. But there is all this propaganda for unity. Does that excuse our party, does it excuse your party from exercising sound judgment in determining whether a policy is or is not right?

The next thing the bill does is to violate our well-established principle and views in regard to education. I have always opposed any Federal Government aid to schools and I have done that because I do not want under any circumstances the Federal Government dominating the schools of our country. Yet what do you do in this bill? I will call your attention to a few things.

On page 3 the Secretary may provide orientation courses and other appropri-

ate services, and so forth. You will find on going through the bill that so far as the exchange of these professors is concerned what we teach them and what they teach us will not be dominated by the superintendent of your schools, not by your school board, but by the Secretary of State, who, by any test, is not required to be an expert on education.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I cannot yield right now. I make the statement that this proposal flies in the face of our well-established educational policy and I stand on that.

It also violates our well-established immigration policy. Some years ago we thought it was in the interest of our Nation to establish a quota system, and we did that. We have tried to live up to it. We have screened carefully individuals who come to this Nation. I think the statement made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS] is entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY: Page 5, lines 15 and 16, strike out line 15 and line 16 up to and including the word "corps" and substitute therefor the words "of such personnel."

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose today, as the gentleman from South Dakota has suggested, merely to pick out some of those parts of this bill with which I find myself in disagreement and to bring them to your attention. You will note that this section 301 is a very broad section. It provides for the detailing of personnel having special scientific or technical or professional qualifications. In that part where I have suggested the amendment it is stated, "Nothing in this act, however, shall authorize the assignment of officers or enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for service relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government."

I realize that the personnel of the military forces in uniform is in a special category; yet it seems to me that this particular provision is merely a subterfuge as far as we are concerned. You are providing for specialists to go abroad. Those specialists may be Reserve officers of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, or any other military branch of the Government. Mr. Chairman, I may say that we have plenty of Reserve officers who are just as good as the Regulars along these lines. Are we going to turn around and embark upon the project of helping various nations of the world organize and increase their defense equipment, or equipment for aggression, whatever you want to call it? Are we going to do like we did recently when we took a considerable number of Reserve aviators of the Army and put them on inactive duty and then sent them over to fight the

Japs in China? It is exactly the same thing. I bring this to your attention because we have certain military missions to do just the things which might be done under the present language of this bill. I understand a bill is going to be brought in for more military missions. I think we should clarify this language.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me see if I understand the amendment. We retain the limitation but add language which is broad enough so that it includes the Reserve officers, or something of that type; is that the point?

Mr. BRADLEY. That is my specific point. However, there are many people who are civilians. Are we going to send our civilians abroad under governmental authority and at governmental expense, we will say, for the purpose of instructing foreign nations in matters of defense or offense, or are we going to leave that to our military or naval missions which have been duly authorized by Congress?

Mr. MUNDT. We most definitely are not under this bill. As the gentleman knows, before another committee of the House there is legislation on that point.

Mr. BRADLEY. Exactly.

Mr. MUNDT. That is, specifically, why we bar it here. Does the gentleman feel that his language will make that a stronger barrier?

Mr. BRADLEY. By all means. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to inflict myself on the committee for the full length of time. Had it not been for a statement made here on the floor this afternoon that with many Members of the House fear had reached the stage of absurdity, I would not take the floor now. I think it was the gentleman from Oklahoma, for whom I have a very high regard, who suggested that perhaps many of us are unduly apprehensive about the effect of this bill.

Let me call your attention to the fact that today the newspapers of this country are carrying the news that the Communists are offering \$100,000 to have the trial of Mr. Eisler delayed until next October. That is No. 1.

Not long ago the President of the United States suggested that the infiltration of Communists in the departments of the Government was so serious that he thought \$50,000,000 would be required to eradicate them from our Government. That is No. 2.

For the benefit of the many new Members on the floor, let me again repeat that while we were at war with Germany and Japan, we had people inside the departments of the Government here in Washington who were dangerous enough to enter into a conspiracy, those within with those from without, to steal some of the most important war, highly confidential, and top secret files affecting our national security out of the State Department, naval intelligence, and two

or three other agencies of the Government. Where were they found? Two hundred and fifty miles away from Washington, in a pro-Communist magazine office in the city of New York. Let us beware and be careful what we do. There are some reasons why we should have fear of the further infiltration in our Government by people coming to our shores who seek to destroy this Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, they were not adequately punished either.

Mr. DONDERO. No. They were arrested by the FBI. We have great confidence in the ability of the FBI to round up these people. They do not move against criminals until they have the evidence against them. After they were arrested, it is disappointing to know that the FBI in this case functioned only 33 1/3 percent efficiently, because only two of them, who pleaded guilty and paid nominal fines suffered any punishment. The other four were dismissed without a trial. No criticism should attach to the FBI. Other influences, I believe, were brought to bear in these cases.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say at this point that I agree with the gentleman that this is a matter of great importance that we are presently considering. As suggested earlier in the debate, this is the third day it has been before the House for consideration. It is obvious to everyone that there are differences of opinion between individual Republicans and between individual Democrats as to what ought to be done.

The fact yet remains that the measure was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs without adverse voice, as I understand. It has been brought here for consideration. My view is that we should proceed with that consideration as we have been doing, considering each section or each title as we come to it. I certainly am not going to challenge the integrity or the sincerity of any Member who expresses his views in respect to this legislation. To my mind, each Member is being conscientious in what he says about it. However, I certainly am not going to admit the impotence of the House of Representatives, sitting in the Committee of the Whole, to consider a matter of this sort, as we consider many other matters of great importance. As we proceed amendments may be offered, debated, and voted upon. Then I suppose a motion to recommit will be offered, and then, if that motion is not adopted, a vote on final passage will be had. I trust that we can proceed with reasonable expedition.

Mr. DONDERO. I think if I had not gone to Europe 2 years ago and come in personal contact with the people of the Old World I might feel very much different toward this bill. But let me say again as I said the other day, you do not have to spend any money to sell the United States to the people of Europe, because in every country except one, and I repeat it, we were asked to do something

that they might come to the United States. They have heard about us, they know about our Government of freedom and justice. They do not have it over there.

Do you think the people of Russia are going to hear this broadcast, the Voice of America? Do not deceive ourselves. Over there the Government owns everything. The people can hear what the Government wants them to hear, and nothing more. They can read only what the Government wants them to read, and nothing more. They can see only what the Government wants them to see, and nothing more. When it comes to using the power of the Government they will print in a Russian newspaper only that which is critical of the United States, such as strikes and unemployment, and nothing else. They will show nothing in their theaters except films which show the United States at a disadvantage, like the Grapes of Wrath. Do you think they are going to accept a program such as this bill carries and let their people know about it? Even if they did, I understand there are only some 50,000 radio sets in all of Russia, in a population of more than 200,000,000 people.

I do not think you can amend this bill good enough so I can vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRADLEY) there were—ayes 87, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATUS AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 302. Any person, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned and he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, when the amendment offered by the gentleman from California was voted on, I had on the Clerk's desk an amendment to strike out the last three or four lines of that paragraph. Was that amendment out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. No. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman, the Chair will state that the Chair has no information as to amendments on the Clerk's desk or what they contain. That information is brought to the attention of

the House and the Chair when a Member sends up the amendment, rises and addresses the Chair stating that he offers an amendment. The gentleman from Michigan did not do that or at least the Chair did not hear him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the point is the Chair neither saw nor heard me, but I was on my feet seeking recognition when the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] said that the time had been fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair assumes that that is true.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 6, line 3, after the word "agency", strike out the remainder of section 302.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, section 302 reads as follows:

Any person, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned and he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999).

In other words, any person who is assigned for service may also have representation allowances similar to the allowances that have been allowed our representatives abroad.

About 2 weeks ago the House approved of a half million dollars for so-called representation allowances. I think it was generally understood on the floor of the House, and brought out in the hearings, that that fund or at least 75 percent of it goes for entertainment and to buy liquor and things of that kind, which are unnecessary and uncalled for.

This bill would spend \$31,000,000 and then you also give these employees or representatives funds in addition to the \$500,000 that you provided for the other representatives to buy liquor and such things.

The whole thing was a serious matter. We are going to have men and women representing this country who can handle this thing without having to go out and buy liquor and things of that kind to entertain these foreigners abroad. We are getting into the same old situation that we did in these other bills. I refer to a policy that in order to get along with foreigners abroad you have to buy liquor and have parties and give extravagant dinners and have all that sort of flurry and fuss. A certain amount of funds for food is all right, of course, but not just run it into the ground. There is no limitation here. Let us save a part of this money. Let us use a little common sense. Use a little sobriety and strike this out of the bill.

I trust you will go along with me and support this amendment. If you are serious about it, you will adopt this amendment. There is no good reason for granting this allowance in addition to

their salaries, ranging as high as \$16,000 to \$18,000 per year. They are getting a liberal allowance of \$10 a day, but on top of that, under this bill, they will get this further allowance for representation, as they call it, most of which is for liquor and things of that kind. We ought to be above that sort of thing, and not follow such procedure in order to try to get along with foreigners.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. MASON. In the other bill, it was limited to a specific amount, but this bill has no limit.

Mr. REES. That is right. The other bill was limited to half a million dollars. I think last year they spent over \$600,000 for the same thing in Foreign Service. Here there is no limitation at all, except as may be approved by officers in the Department.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will adopt my amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated because I believe it is important for the people whom we send overseas to have some representation allowance. In my own experience I know what it is like not to have such an allowance. I know how important it can be to be able to entertain and to be able to invite people to dinner and talk over matters of common interest. I think it is an important part of our entire representation overseas, whether it occurs in the diplomatic service, in the Army, or in the Navy. I suggest to you that we in this Congress have not been remiss in accepting entertainment from time to time when it has come our way. It seems to me that we should look upon this question with a great deal more sympathy than we do. It is not my idea that people should have unlimited funds to squander, but I simply say that other nations have these representation allowances and it puts the greatest Nation in the world in a rather peculiar position for its representatives to have no such allowance when the other nations have liberal allowances along this line. If this practice is abused, if these funds are squandered, then the personnel in question should be replaced.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman think just because foreign countries spend their money entertaining at liquor parties that we have to follow along their line?

Mr. LODGE. I did not say liquor parties.

Mr. REES. Does not the gentleman think that after all we can get along without that sort of thing?

Mr. LODGE. I know that I personally spent a great deal of my own money during the last war entertaining members of foreign navies overseas. I think it was a useful thing to do. I think such encouragement to friendly cooperation helped to win the war. They will aid in winning the peace.

Mr. REES. I regret that the gentleman finds it is necessary for the prosecu-

tion of the peace that we have to do this sort of thing.

Mr. LODGE. I do not say necessary. I say it is desirable for such American representatives to have an entertainment allowance for the prosecution of the peace. It responds to a factor in human nature. I imagine that most of the Members of this Congress have from time to time had occasion to appreciate the value of this sort of thing.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that the Congress voted themselves \$2,500 expense allowance and part of the argument given on the floor was the expense of entertaining constituents?

Mr. HOFFMAN. O Mr. Chairman, now will the gentleman yield? Was it to purchase liquor?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach some agreement as to time on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add some new testimony to corroborate what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] said a few minutes ago about whether or not these broadcasts would be heard in Russia.

Here is the report of an interview with one who recently escaped from behind the iron curtain. Cholly Knickerbocker in the New York Journal-American on June 10 reports it as follows:

A gaunt, gray-haired man, the terror of what he had left behind still in his eyes, sat across our desk. . . . He was a Catholic priest from Croatia, and a former professor of economics at one of the universities there. . . . The man had only escaped from Russian-dominated Europe only a few weeks before. . . .

Here is a condensation of what he told us: American radio broadcasts to Russia are absolutely worthless. There are only a few people in Russia—all top party members—who can receive an American broadcast. All other radio sets in Russia are fixed so they can only tune in Soviet stations.

That is the testimony of one who has been behind the iron curtain about broadcasts to Russia. Then here is a report by Karl Von Wiegand, American correspondent of the New York Journal-American in central Europe:

A well-known former Austrian diplomat telephoned me today that there is "great uneasiness in the American, British, and French zones of Austria. What good to us are the daily broadcasts to Austria Voice of America telling us of peace, prosperity, and freedom in your democracy? The Allies promised us peace, independence, and freedom. Two long years we have waited and we see no sign of your promises being made good. Our faith in the west is sinking fast."

That is a testimonial last week from Austria.

This bill reminds me of the time when a fish peddler came down the street with his little cart. He stopped at a house and the lady came out and took one of his fish out of the wagon to inspect it. Then she was afflicted with that indecision that sometimes characterizes feminine shoppers and she was unable to make up her mind. The peddler in exasperation shouted: "Lady, lady, if you don't like the fish, put him back in the wagon."

From all we have heard here about this proposal it seems we might better put it back in the wagon by sending it back to the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman referred a moment ago to a report sent back by Knickerbocker with regard to how many people in Russia heard this program. In the committee hearings I asked Gen. Bedell Smith specifically about that very matter.

I read from the hearings as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD. You have answered part of my next question which is, are these radio sets geared to Russian stations only, or are they capable of picking up outside stations?

General SMITH. Most of them are sets capable of handling short wave. You see, the Soviet Union is a country of vast distances, and a great deal of broadcasting from Moscow is done by short wave. The majority of the ones that I have mentioned will handle short wave and receive our broadcasts without any difficulty.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there any attempt being made to jam our broadcasts?

General SMITH. None whatsoever.

Mr. BUFFETT. You can interpret that testimony in several ways. Personally, I normally would prefer the testimony of one who has lived among the rank and file of the people over that from the embassies, where the thinking may be somewhat influenced by what the State Department desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to take a fair and impartial view of this whole situation throughout the days we have been debating the bill, a practical view as to what value it is to the United States, and the amount of money we shall be called upon to appropriate to meet the situation.

As I recall the \$31,000,000 in the original budget request that was knocked out on a point of order did not include the broad aspects of the present bill that is before us at all; it was merely in there as the recommendation of the Secretary of State for broadcasting. As a result of its being knocked out a bill was presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee—and from what source I do not know; evidently the State Department had something to do with it—to broaden it so as to permit the bringing into this country of students for exchange for educational purposes and, as you all know, for many other purposes, includ-

ing associations, agencies, and societies, and I quote from title 7:

TITLE VII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

THE SECRETARY

SEC. 701. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) In carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries;

(2) to furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries;

(3) in carrying out title V of this act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States for periods not to exceed 10 years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation act;

(4) to furnish official entertainment when provided for by the appropriation act;

(5) to establish and maintain in the United States reception centers for foreign students and for visitors representative of the fields listed in section 201 above;

(6) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);

(7) to employ, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation act, (i) persons on a temporary basis, and (ii) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available; and

(8) to create such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act. No committee member shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services; but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 702. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this act, subject to approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended;

(4) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, without regard to the

Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended, to provide for planned travel itineraries within the United States by groups of citizens or subjects of other countries, to pay the expenses of such travel, and to detail, as escorts of such groups, officers and employees of the Government, whose expenses may be paid out of funds advanced or transferred by the Secretary for the general expenses of the itineraries;

(5) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study; and
(6) to provide for, and pay the expenses of, attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with furthering the purposes of this act when provided for by the appropriation act.

These are very broad powers.

Insofar as delivering the Voice of America to that part of Europe and Asia that will receive it, I have no objection, although even that has certain restrictions and inhibitions. I am not convinced that the Voice will be heard by the people we hope it will be heard by. What assurances do we have that the Voice of America going into the satellite countries of Russia will not be monitored by the Russian Government and rebroadcast to suit their own purpose? If it is received directly by any receiving set in that area, there can be contradictory statements made over their own broadcasting system to discount ours. That is the practical view I am taking of this thing. It may take several million dollars to do it.

The bill is too broad and I think not thought out sufficiently by the Foreign Affairs Committee to be passed in its present form. It should be recommitted. It should be brought down to the point where those of us who feel from a practical point of view we could support it if it were a broadcast proposition, rather than having it on the broader scale which includes the many other things it now contains. I am told that there are—and I note from press reports that there are—some 17,000 students in the United States from foreign sources at the present time. I am also told by a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee that this bill would regulate that situation to the point that perhaps there would be less than 17,000 students in this country under the bill. If they want to exchange students, then the Foreign Affairs Committee ought to be broad enough to realize that the restriction in the bill will cut down this number and there will be less benefit from the exchange of students from foreign countries if the bill is passed.

There is now a broad exchange. Another aspect of the bill is that we are endeavoring to have the people of Europe and Asia believe in freedom, liberty, and independence, which, incidentally, in my opinion, are virtues to be acquired, not to be sold. You cannot tell any country because they do not have independence that they ought to acquire it. They know that without being told. Freedom is something they have to work for. We do not have it to sell over the radio. These students who are here now on their own resources, in my opinion, are far more respectable in the fact they are here on their own, rather than if they

were here through the benevolence of this country. The type of students you would get otherwise would be those that their government desired to be here, not those who desired on their own part to come here, as the 17,000 who are in this country at the present time. I do not object to broadcasting, as limited as it may be in reaching the sources we hope to reach, but I certainly believe that the bill in its broad aspects should be recommended and revised by the Foreign Affairs Committee before being finally approved by the House.

We should be thinking and doing more for our veterans who are in educational institutions in this country, who need additional aid to carry on their studies and take care of their families. We have many obligations here at home to look after before we add more benefits to foreign countries, which have reached into billions of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the Committee as to what it considers the representation allowance to be? Something was said about the salaries of individuals outside this country. I note in the State Department hearings, page 397, that the individuals under this program of the OIC draw the following salaries: At Moscow, \$18,600; Paris, \$17,360; London, \$16,960; Rome, \$16,000; Ankara, \$15,200; Nanking, \$15,060. I suppose that includes the representation allowance?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say to the gentleman that those are figures which include your change in living costs because of the highly inflationary conditions overseas. In justice to our employees over there, as the gentleman knows, because he has traveled abroad, we provide these allowances. It really does not give a true picture as to your representation account, for it includes money with which to supply food to people, if you invite them to dinner to discuss a problem, the same as if you were a salesman for an American business concern. It is a legitimate, well-established practice. It certainly does not involve drinking bouts, or licentious parties of any kind. I can set the gentleman's mind at rest in that respect.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On page 13, section 4, money is provided to furnish official entertainment. At the proper time I hope the gentleman will explain what official entertainment is.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; for instance, a public dinner given in honor of a distinguished visiting guest would be official entertainment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MUNDT) there were—ayes 45, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE UNDER ANOTHER GOVERNMENT

SEC. 303. Any person while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under authority of this act may, at the discretion of his Government agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary, and without additional compensation therefor, accept an office under the government to which he is assigned, if the acceptance of such an office in the opinion of such agency is necessary to permit the effective performance of duties for which he is assigned, including the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government the disbursement of funds provided by such government or of receiving from such foreign government funds for deposit and disbursement on behalf of such government, in carrying out programs undertaken pursuant to this act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 6, strike out section 303.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it must be evident to the members of the committee that this bill as brought in by the committee does not meet with the approval, at least, of the majority Members though it has the support of our political opponents.

Now, undoubtedly the committee did its best. It brought in a bill which, at the time, it thought was the best bill that could be written. But someone put something over on the Republican members of that committee. Subsequently, and since the discussion and debate on the floor, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in charge of this bill has suggested several times that he wanted this bill debated section by section and amendments offered, and we are pursuing that policy. In behalf of his committee he has accepted several amendments—evidently seeking support for the bill.

We all know the difficulty of writing a good bill on the floor. Where a bill is as bad as is this bill, it is almost impossible to correct its faults on the floor. It would seem to me that it would be for the benefit of the party, at least it would be party wisdom, for the majority members of the committee to withdraw this bill, ask to have it recommitted to the committee, and then call in, after reading the RECORD of the last 3 days' debate, those gentlemen who might wish to appear and offer amendments and rewrite the bill in committee. Let us wash our white linen, if you wish to call it that, the Republican linen, in committee, either through a conference of the Republican members of that committee or a conference of all the Republicans, and see where we stand. Many a vote on amendments has shown that the Republicans are not in favor of this bill. A small group of Republicans, backed by a United Democratic Party, are putting across a New Deal measure.

I recall distinctly the other day that an overwhelming majority of the Republicans wanted to strike the enacting clause of this bill. Of the Republicans 87 voted to kill the bill; 53 Republicans, with Democratic support, kept it alive. Why should we not now take the bill back to the committee and let the committee, as suggested, rewrite it?

Now, to go back a moment. The committee is headed by a distinguished former clergyman. But he either forgot to tell the committee or the committee disregarded the suggestion made long, long years ago that no man can serve two masters. If you will turn to page 5 you will find in section 302 that—

Any person, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States.

So he has one master there in that section.

Then, over in this section where I seek to strike certain words, it provides that when he is so assigned his duties will include the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government of the disbursement of funds or receiving such funds from that government. He may become an officer of that government and may, at the discretion of his government agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary, accept an office under the government to which he is assigned.

How is a fellow going to serve two masters? How is an officer of the United States to be assigned to another government and then serve under that government? Can a man serve as an officer of two governments at the same time. You see my point?

It does seem to me that in all fairness, having the welfare of the Republican Party as well as the welfare of the country at heart, and I regard them as synonymous, that this bill might well voluntarily be taken back by the committee. Accepting that suggestion, the committee would have the grateful and heartfelt thanks of the majority of the Republicans. Then let the committee rewrite the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman has propounded this question about a man serving two masters. We have a concrete example of it in five instances, involving five employees of the State Department during the war, when the Germans were killing our boys and the Japs were killing our boys. These men in the State Department, who took an oath of office to faithfully and loyally serve this country, stole the secrets of the State Department and of the Navy Department and sold them to a Russian sympathizer, and they went scot free.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and the administration lightly tapped them on the wrist.

Mr. JENNINGS. You have a concrete illustration there of how no man can serve two masters. They served one and betrayed it to another.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but that is no reason why we should attempt to legalize the practice, and the gentleman's statement is forewarning of what is apt to happen under the bill if accepted as written.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes; not on the section, because there are other amendments to the section.

Mr. GAVIN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment cease in 15 minutes, and I will include myself in that. The chairman can divide up the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is this change of voice due to?

Mr. GAVIN. I am trying to appear as a statesman.

There has been a great deal of talk about this exchange of students. I have a letter from Mr. Benton, the Assistant Secretary of State, under date of the 29th of January, in which he submits to me a speech that he made before the Conference of Patriotic Women's Organizations for National Defense, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., Saturday, January 25. He discussed this matter relative to the interchange of students and he refers to UNESCO, which means United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.

He said:

UNESCO will seek to eradicate illiteracy everywhere, and to lift educational standards. Illiterate men are pawns in a power struggle. UNESCO will seek to reduce barriers to the free flow of ideas and information everywhere. The most literate peoples can be led and bullied into aggression when they are cut off from a full and steady account of development among other peoples, and fed on lies and distortions. UNESCO will seek to diagnose the social and psychological tensions that lead to conflict, as urged in Congressman DIRKSEN's bill. And UNESCO will stimulate the exchange of students, teachers, scholars, and experts on the widest possible scale. In such ways UNESCO will strive to lay that solid foundation of understanding among peoples which is the best hope of peace. As UNESCO succeeds, our security, and the world's security, will be strengthened. The operating budget for all of UNESCO for 1947 is \$6,000,000. This is, I should guess, one ten-thousandth of the world's military and naval expenditures this year.

Then he goes on to say:

The exchange of students is an example. I know of no surer method of increasing understanding of the United States, for the long run, than to bring foreign students to live among us for a year or two.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I wonder if the gentleman would permit me to complete these few lines? I would appreciate it very much. I thank the gentleman, my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania for consideration given me.

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman, my able colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. As I was saying, he goes on to say:

If this is true, and if the understanding they acquire contributes to our security, then we should invite such students not in terms of a few score or a few hundreds but in terms of thousands. And we should widen the area from which we assist such students, not limit it to Latin America. We must widen our horizons and raise our sights. This will require the basic legislation, to which I have referred, and it will then require a budget.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] very much.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, on this particular section 303 I am going to agree with the gentleman from Michigan because I have an amendment on it myself. I do not like the provision of this language on line 20 which says, "including the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government the disbursement of funds provided by such government or of receiving from such foreign government funds for deposit."

The language is too general. We receive their funds into the hands of our employees for deposit and disbursement on behalf of such government and disburse it for them.

Unless the committee accepts the amendment striking out everything beginning with the word "including" on line 20 so that it cuts out this financial set-up, I am going to vote for the amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN because I have such an amendment myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, back in December 1945, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], who was then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, introduced H. R. 4982. That bill was reported 4 days later by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Because of the opposition of some of us in the Rules Committee, the bill was not reported to the floor of the House until late in 1946—I think in July. It finally passed the House on July 22. I have a copy of that bill before me. It is quite similar to the measure H. R. 3342 which is now before the House. I have been rather amazed that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who introduced the original bill, has not been heard in support of H. R. 3342, nor has he participated in debate thereon, to my knowledge. I am just

wondering if there has been some new information, or some reason, which has come to the gentleman from New York for his not supporting this measure which is so similar to the bill which he originally introduced, and which has been reintroduced in the House by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. I am addressing my questions to others, thank you. It is rather difficult for me to understand why the outstanding Democratic leader of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not supporting this measure at this time by his voice. Why has his voice been stilled, I ask?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Perhaps he thinks he can slip it through with a Republican label.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. I think such a surmise is a challenge to the honesty of purpose of the gentleman, with which I do not agree.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I do not yield at this time. I think perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has some significant information, or has some other good reason why he has withdrawn his support from this measure, and has not spoken out in favor of it.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. In all fairness to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the author of the bill last year, to which the gentleman refers, and who is not present today—

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is present today. He has great influence in this body. He has great influence with me. I am sure there are many Members of this House who would like to hear from the gentleman from New York. It seems to me very peculiar and very strange that the gentleman has been silent all through this debate.

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, the debate is not over yet, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And this bill is not yet law, I can, in turn assure the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of anything that could be more dangerous in a troubled House than to have a provision in a bill such as section 303, which would certainly be an incentive to create many Benedict Arnolds. It seems to me the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has very properly presented a motion to the House which should be supported, to strike this language from the bill. I have not heard any argument against it. Perhaps the gentleman from South Dakota, the author of the bill, may speak against it, but I would like to ask him just now why it is

necessary for an employee of our Government, working for the Government in this type of work, who would certainly be reasonably well paid, to accept or take pay from a foreign government. Under what theory, in the name of common sense, is that done?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Not a part of the salary but the entire salary and expenses are to be paid by the foreign government because the man must become attached to that government, and the reason he should become attached to that government is so that in some official capacity he has some regulation over the particular division, department, or activity assigned to him by that government.

I have the concluding 3 minutes of the debate and I do not want to infringe on the gentleman's time. I hope he will listen to my further explanation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right, but if you look at the top of page 6 you will see the following language:

And of the Government agency from which assigned he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency.

Mr. O'HARA. It has always been fundamental to me that an officer of the government, whether it be municipal, State, or Federal, certainly could not serve two masters.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan wholeheartedly. I think it is a situation that no matter how well-intentioned the language may be, is going to make for trouble sooner or later. I hope it will be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that this is not a new departure in American policy. It is something we have been doing for a long while in special cases. We had in this House some years ago a very distinguished Representative from Illinois by the name of Charles Dewey. After World War I, under special emergency legislation he was assigned to a specific phase of a similar program in which he served as a member of the Polish Cabinet and he was doing that in connection with the correction of the finances of that government.

It so happens that in many joint enterprises such as the operation of a weather bureau and certain other things which are the joint responsibility of two countries, this would enable the director of that station under the jurisdiction of the two countries to be an American. It permits him as well to have authority within that country so he can work with effectiveness.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. In a moment.

I think it is important that we have clearly in mind the language on which we are voting.

I would like to say that if we keep this

section in the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] has put his finger on a very important point. He has discussed it with our subcommittee and we have agreed to accept an amendment which he will propose. His amendment prohibits any American from taking an oath of loyalty to any foreign country or any foreign government, even though serving temporarily in an official capacity for that government. With that safeguard I am convinced it is an important extra safeguard in this legislation. It is not a basically essential part of the bill, of course, but it is important because it does give one additional tool to those to whom we look to fight our battle for the peace. It gives them one additional shell in their ammunition kit, one additional approach and avenue whereby we can work together in a friendly, constructive manner with countries friendly to us and whose friendship we propose to preserve.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman, to defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan to strike out section 303.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEEFE) there were—ayes 64, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY: Page 6, line 25, after the word "act", substitute a comma for the period and add the following: "Provided, however, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government."

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, some few days ago in speaking on this bill I offered criticism of the provision which would allow any official or appointee of this Government to accept an office under some other government, and I objected to it because there seemed to be no provision there which would keep that official from taking an oath of allegiance to the other government. Having spoken with the subcommittee chairman, I find the committee agreeable to accepting the amendment just offered. I see no reason to take up any more time in this argument. I appreciate that present laws may be considered to preclude the taking of the oath of allegiance by one of our people to another government, but I am afraid that the present wording here might be considered as a change in present law.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to thank the gentleman for his constructive thinking on that matter. There never has been a case of one of our officials taking such an oath, but I agree with the gentleman we better be doubly safe than sorry and we are happy to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 6, line 20, strike out all after the word "assigned."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I am offering is really a compromise amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], was to strike out the whole of section 303. I do not want our employees over there in foreign governments, who are given money by foreign governments, to disburse on behalf of foreign governments and be responsible to foreign governments and then have our taxpayers in this country take the final responsibility that these employees did the right job.

If you will notice, this particular section does not say how much these Americans can dispense for foreign governments. We could take their whole budget and dispense it under this section or we could take over all the import or export duties, the customs of a country, for example, and disburse the funds through our employees. The language is too general. Under one interpretation, it would be the start of imperialism to me. I do not want to handle the budget of any foreign government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask this question not in hostility to the gentleman's amendment. As I read the amendment, the adoption of it would do away with the amendment which the Committee of the Whole just agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. I have discussed that with the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] and I believe that the two amendments can be made to conform.

Mr. WADSWORTH. His has already been adopted.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will not the gentleman modify his amendment to strike out the part between the word "assigned" in line 17 down to and including the word "Act" in line 25, which would leave the amendment just adopted effective in case the gentleman's amendment should be adopted?

Mr. FULTON. I will do that because that will make the gentleman's amendment complementary to mine. First, our employees cannot take an oath of allegiance to a foreign government; and second, our employees are not going to run the government of the country, which may happen if they run the money power of that country. You cannot set up people in foreign governments without limit and have them run the disbursements of a foreign government. This section has no limit in it.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this information bill and will vote for its passage, because I think it is necessary, but there are several places that the provisions need revision. I am a member of the

Foreign Affairs Committee and have had amendments that I have not put in that would tighten this bill, because I felt that at times certain people speaking were merely trying to delay and cut out the main purpose of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sure the gentleman is not aware of the facts I am about to give him, but will the gentleman take my word for it that in the agreements consummated through the inter-American Coordinator, the Latin-American countries have contributed their own funds in a very substantial measure, and if a provision like this had not been available and not written in this bill, exchange restrictions, in other words, the money could not be sent up here and sent back, which would result in our not getting that protection at all.

Mr. FULTON. Let me say this: If that is all you intend, why is it not written in this bill that there is a limit on it, because the provisions of this bill are so broad you could go in and run the customs of the country and nobody could stop you. I have confidence in the State Department, but unless you put a specific limitation in here saying that is the purpose, you do not have adequate legislation.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Was the gentleman's amendment and the other amendments to which he refers brought up and discussed in the committee and if so, why were they not adopted there?

Mr. FULTON. They were not discussed at the time of the committee hearing as I have been working hard on the Philippine rehabilitation bill.

Mr. BREHM. My question is not meant as a reflection on the gentleman's integrity. He is a hard-working and sincere Member of Congress.

Mr. FULTON. Thank you for your comment as I value your judgment as another hard-working Member of Congress. I discussed them personally with certain committee members, but I do not want in any way to endanger by amendment the purposes of the information bill that I am for, but I want it tightened.

Mr. BREHM. So do I, and I dislike to be accused of not being for a bill because I take exception to certain parts of it.

Mr. FULTON. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is 100 percent for this bill. I am for it, but that does not mean that 100 percent of the time I am for every provision in the bill. I am not and I have not been. I am one of the moderate, practical members of the Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman just stated that the bill is broader than he expected it to be.

Mr. FULTON. Broader than I first expected it to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. Does the gentleman wish to modify his amendment? If so, in what respect?

Mr. FULTON. I agree to modify my amendment as suggested by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object to the modification of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FULTON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to modify my amendment, and I ask the gentleman to withhold his objection, because it is doing what he wants.

I modify my amendment by striking out on page 6, line 17, all after the word "assigned" down to and including the word "act" in line 25, for which I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VORYS. I object.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has just been said by the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], this is not a life or death matter. It is certainly not the most important part of the bill. On the other hand it does not authorize anything new. We have been doing it effectively in the Latin-American program for a long time. Americans did it in Poland and Iran after the First War. This section merely makes this available to other parts of the world, including Europe, Asia, and Africa, the sort of assistance from American experts which we have been extending to South America.

Therefore it seems wholly unnecessary and too bad, when we are trying to develop a program where members of our Government and members of other governments can work in closest cooperation for the benefit of both, for us to hog-tie and handcuff them.

Before this world has pulled out of the mess it is in, it is going to be necessary for financial experts and medical experts and technical experts from America to help right down at the grass roots in many of these countries; yes, right in their governments. Some of them are already appealing for such American assistance as they did after World War I. This section merely permits the American expert or technician or professional man to do the job that they want him to come and do right in their government, and which we in our own interest want him to be able to do.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that years and years ago Morgan Shuster, an American, went to Persia and, by going into their government and being their finance officer, put their finances in order, and that the greatest contribution that Americans could make in many of these countries is in their fiscal policies and helping them in their disbursement of funds?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is wholly correct.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman is correct in the observation he has made, but I asked the gentleman to yield in order to propound an inquiry. If the committee does not complete consideration of the bill during the afternoon, is it contemplated that the House will sit tomorrow?

Mr. JUDD. I must refer that question to the chairman of the committee. But it is my hope that we will stay here and finish it tonight. I believe we are through the worst of the difficulties, and I think that we can bring these sections up one by one, offer amendments, and vote them up or vote them down, and proceed with the disposition of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot do that at this time.

Mr. FULTON. Then I stand on my original amendment, to strike out the part after the word "assigned."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN:
Strike out section 303 as now amended.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, let us see where we are. Turn to page 5, title III, down on line 14:

Nothing in this act, however, shall authorize the assignment of officers or enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for service relating to the organization, training operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

That is the exception. Otherwise men in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard could be assigned by the Department of State for military service in other countries under section 302, and remain American officers under that section. Yes; and under subsequent sections become an officer of another country—to me an impossible situation.

Then turn over the next section and you learn that it provides that when so assigned he shall become an officer of the foreign government. The Committee just sought to cure that by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY], but the Committee did not cure it. If he is assigned as an officer of another government, how can this Government tell the other government what qualifications or requirements it shall make? We lose all control of him if he is assigned over there, or his assignment is null and void until he accepts the qualifications put on by the other government.

I am asking you this now: Under our Constitution and our form of government, how can any officer or private in the Army or an enlisted man in the Navy become an officer of another govern-

ment? You see where we are getting? I go back to the original argument, how can an officer so assigned serve two masters? There are men here sitting before me who served in this war as officers of our Government.

They are still on the reserve list if they are not on the active list. Yet, the Secretary of State can assign those officers to other governments, and there they may become officers of that government. The only way you can cure this situation is to strike out this section. We came within six votes of doing it before. It should be stricken now, and then the committee, if the bill goes back to the committee, can rewrite the bill, or if it goes to a conference they can fix it in conference. I hope when they are considering this bill in conference they will have better luck than the House conferees on the labor legislation had when they came back with a report.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was sitting over here a few moments ago listening to the gentleman from Ohio make his statement. I was wondering how I was going to answer it. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a great number of years. The other day there was a rule which was brought before the House and which was adopted, providing that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the ranking minority member should have control of the time. If the Chair remembers, I was sitting in my seat and the Chair recognized me to have control of the time. The gentleman from South Dakota made the statement that the time was to be controlled by the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the minority of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I did not want to at that time say anything or do anything that would give the impression to the House or to the committee that there was any dissension in the Committee on Foreign Affairs with reference to this legislation. So I politely acquiesced and left the table.

I do not know by what authority or by what right any Member can change a rule adopted by this House at a moment's notice and say who is to be in control of the bill on the floor or what the purpose was, but naturally I was out. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs automatically was out also.

You have been debating this bill not under the authority of the rule as adopted by the House, but under some legerdemain that I cannot quite understand.

My principal object in arising at this time, Mr. Chairman, after listening to this debate is to say this. I am 100 percent in favor of this legislation. I think we here, 435 Members of the House, are considering a piece of legislation that will determine the whole future and success of this country.

I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a number of years. I have traveled all over and I know what is going on or at least I think I do.

Never mind all these trivial amendments or suggestions being made, but let us pass this bill. Let us put it into action because if we do not, and if you think you are trying to amend this bill so as to make it more perfect you will destroy it. If you should lose after the 1st of July all that the Government of the United States has within its hands and within its breast you will have lost it forever and will not get it back.

Now, that is all there is to it. Now, please pass this legislation, and pass it now. Let us leave it to the State Department or leave it to somebody to make a perfect bill, and not write this bill the way you are doing on the floor. Let us put this bill into action and let the Secretary of State, or whoever has charge of it, make it perfect in operation. I have objected to a great many things that they have been doing under the legislation heretofore, but please, gentlemen, do something that the United States will not lose control to do the things we want to do. If you want to make this country of ours successful in the future, this is the only way to do it, and do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to strike section 303 as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 70, noes 81.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MUNDT and Mr. HOFFMAN to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 87, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, in carrying on any activity under the authority of this act, to utilize, with their approval, the services, facilities, and personnel of the other Government agencies. Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. In utilizing the Government agencies, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the best available and qualified Government services, facilities, and personnel shall be sought, in order to ensure professional competence and avoid duplication; and (2) that the Secretary shall consult the appropriate technical agencies of the Government concerning any activity authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act which comes within the competence of such agencies.

TECHNICAL AND OTHER SERVICES

SEC. 402. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, may perform such

technical or other services as such agency may be competent to render for the government of another country desirous of obtaining such services, upon terms and conditions which are satisfactory to the Secretary and to the head of the Government agency, when it is determined by the Secretary that such services will contribute to the purposes of this act. However, nothing in this act shall authorize the performance of services relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

POLICY GOVERNING SERVICES

SEC. 403. In authorizing the performance of technical and other services under section 402 above, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage through the Government agency with appropriate legislative authority the performance of such services to foreign governments by qualified private American individuals and agencies; (2) that if such services are rendered by a Government agency, they shall demonstrate the technical accomplishments of the United States, such services being of an advisory, investigative, or instructional nature, or a demonstration of a technical process; (3) that such services shall not include the construction of public works or the supervision of the construction of public works, except as may be accessory to such investigation, instruction, or demonstration, and that, under authority of this act, a Government agency shall render engineering services related to public works only when the Secretary shall determine that the national interest demands the rendering of such services by a Government agency, but this policy shall not be interpreted to preclude the assignment of individual specialists as advisers to other governments as provided under title III of this act, together with such incidental assistance as may be necessary for the accomplishment of their individual assignments; (4) that such services shall not be undertaken for a foreign government if, in the opinion of the head of the Government agency, such services will impair the fulfillment of domestic responsibilities of that agency; and (5) that the Department shall invite outstanding leaders, both within and outside the Federal Government, in the various fields of engineering in the United States, to review and extend advice on the Secretary's policies in rendering engineering services to another government pursuant to section 402 of this act.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I am unable to follow the Clerk. He seems to be missing very important sections of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may return to section 403 and read as printed in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the section.

(The Clerk again read the section.)

With the following committee amendments:

Page 8, line 11, strike out "section 402 above" and insert "this title."

Page 9, line 13, after the word "leaders", insert "in the United States."

Page 9, line 14, strike out "various fields of engineering in the United States" and insert "various fields of activity covered by this title."

Page 9, line 17, strike out "engineering" and insert "technical and other."

Page 9, line 18, strike out "section 402 of this Act" and insert "this title."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FELLOWS: Page 8, lines 22 and 24, after the words "public works", line 22, strike out the words "except as may be accessory to such investigation, instruction, or demonstration."

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. On page 8, section 403, line 22, after the words "public works" it strikes out the words "except as may be accessory to such investigation, instruction, or demonstration."

My objection to this is it would permit the State Department to construct public works in a foreign land if it sees fit to do so and I do not think that that power should be in this bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has discussed this amendment with the subcommittee and we accept it as an additional worth-while safeguard to the bill.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRAINING

SEC. 404. Any Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to provide to citizens of other countries.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 9, line 23, after the word "countries", insert "and to citizens of the United States going to other countries in connection with the carrying out of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERCHANGE OF SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

SEC. 405. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to promote the interchange with other countries of scientific and specialized knowledge and skills, within the fields in which such agency has competence, through publications and other scientific and educational materials.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

SEC. 406. In order that the activities of Government agencies authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act may be effectively coordinated and interdepartmental relationships as authorized by this act may be clearly defined, the Secretary may establish upon direction of the President an interdepartmental committee to advise the Secretary on the development and administration of these activities.

TITLE V.—DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ABOUT THE UNITED STATES ABROAD

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it appropriate, to provide for the preparation, and dissemination abroad, of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, through press, publications, radio, motion pictures, and other information media, and through information centers abroad.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 11, line 3, after the word "centers", insert "and instructors."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: Add the following to section 501:

"All such press releases and radio scripts shall, in the English language, be made available to press associations, newspapermen, radio systems and stations in the United States within 15 days after release as information abroad."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, one of the mysteries that must concern anyone listening to the debate here is just what is this Voice of America? From early youth each of us has in song and story heard of the Voice of America as being the voice of the worker, the hum in the factory, the happy home life, private enterprise, individual effort, and the reward for the best a man can do here. Those of us who have had the privilege of seeing some of the samples of the so-called art of America which have been sent abroad; those of us who have had occasion to look over some of the broadcasts which have been made purporting to be the Voice of America, have properly wondered just what phase of American life is portrayed by the State Department as the Voice of America. Is it the voice of the real America, or the voice of the minority?

I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that after these Voice of America broadcasts have been made available overseas, that the information be made available to our various means for dissemination of knowledge here in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say what the gentleman proposes is completely consistent with what the committee has in mind in making the reports available to Congress. The gentleman's amendment makes them available to other public-service groups as well, and the committee will be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

POLICIES GOVERNING INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

SEC. 502. In authorizing international information activities under this act, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private American individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information; (3) that the Department

shall invite outstanding private leaders of the United States in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities; and (4) that all printed matter, films, broadcasts, and other materials in the fields of mass media shall, when disseminated by the Government, be identified as to Government or private source.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the period at the end of the section. I do not want to strike out even one word of this section because, in my judgment, it is an important section of the bill, possibly because I wrote it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, last year when a similar bill was pending for 7 months it did not get to the floor of the Congress until the State Department agreed to take the amendment which I offered. When that amendment was accepted the bill was brought up and passed, under suspension of the rules, receiving a two-thirds vote of the House. The exact text of that amendment is contained in section 502 of the present bill.

I do not wish to reread section 502, which has just been read. The gist of it is that this whole information program is to encourage and facilitate the dissemination abroad of information by private sources, to supplement such sources when necessary, and the State Department is to reduce the Government program whenever it is possible; that there shall be no Government monopoly in any medium of information; that outstanding leaders in private life shall be called in to review and monitor the programs, and that in all such Government propaganda all information shall be identified as to Government or private source.

I feel, as the rest of you do, that nothing is more abhorrent to us in America than a Government propaganda machine. On the other hand, after intensive study of this for nearly 2 years, I am convinced that we need such a propaganda machine in a world where a battle of ideas is now going on, and totalitarian states have the powerful weapon of government propaganda in their arsenals. I personally abhor the use of atomic bombs, of poison gas, of bacteriological warfare, but I have voted for funds to have them ready, if our national security requires their use. Our enemies sometimes force on us the choice of weapons. We need whatever weapons others may use against us, in order to survive. We need not in the future, but right now, an efficient propaganda machine in order to survive in a warfare of ideas that is going on, not in the future, but now.

I read the current Saturday Evening Post last night. There is an article in there, "The True Meaning of the Iron Curtain," by Ernest O. Hauser, who spent 3 years in Europe. He is one of the Post editors. I do not have time to read you all of it, although I commend it all to your attention, but let me read these sentences to you. Hauser says:

Ideas will have to be fought with ideas. It is hard to convey to Americans that the

people of Europe are more starved for ideas than for bread, but it is nevertheless true. In our attempt to hold the line against Russia in Europe, we have not even begun to use ideological weapons.

Then he goes on:

While most of our ideological outposts in Europe, thus far, consist of tucked-away, inadequately staffed and supplied information centers and reading rooms, struggling along on puny budgets, the sledge-hammer blows of Soviet propaganda fall everywhere.

I visited our reading room in Istanbul this spring. They have 1,200 reference books. Four hundred of them are taken out every month—a record for any library. They have 50 library visitors a day, 80 percent students, 10 percent press, and 10 percent government officials. This little whisper of the Voice of America is very effective, but the sledge hammer of Soviet radio across the Turkish border was also potent.

Mr. Hauser goes on to say in his article:

Moscow is currently reported as spending as much on political advertising—mostly in Europe—as the rest of the world combined, and every ruble pays dividends.

Going on further to discuss ideological warfare he concludes his article with these words:

Barring another war, this is the only manner in which the West can hope to push the Iron Curtain back to where it belongs—the Russian border.

This present bill, the Mundt bill, would authorize the continuation of the American information program, which is our only Government propaganda machine in this psychological warfare.

Bill Benton, who made a great fortune as an advertising genius, and who is heading up this program, has oversold it in one respect. This program is not the Voice of America, as it has been advertised. The Voice of America wells from 140,000,000 American minds and hearts and throats. Bill Benton believes that, too. As provided in section 502 that has just been read, and Bill Benton approves of that section, this program is only a very small adjunct to the real Voice of America. This program is only for the purpose of supplementing the Voice of America where the Voice of America does not reach. It is only for the purpose of piercing the iron curtain where the Voice of America cannot be heard. It is only a small program supplemental to the great Voice of America that is welling over the world, but a very necessary program, a propaganda machine, if you please, in an age when propaganda is so important, when, as Hauser says in the article I mentioned:

Barring another war, this is the only manner in which the West can hope to push the iron curtain back to where it belongs.

I now withdraw my pro forma amendment. I am in favor of this section, unamended. I am for this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the amendment to this title in section 501 which was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] in which it was required that copies of broadcasts and other informa-

tion sent abroad should be made available to the press and radio of this country.

I wanted to submit an amendment to his amendment, but when the committee quickly accepted the Simpson amendment I did not have that opportunity. My amendment to the amendment would have provided that the Members of the Congress of the United States, upon request, should also be furnished with this information.

I am now serving notice that while I understand an amendment of that nature will be offered; that, if not, I expect to offer an amendment to section 209 which will provide that the Members of the Congress of the United States, who represent the people, shall upon request be furnished with a copy of any broadcast, publication or statement put out under the provisions of this act, if it should become law.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I regret that our acceptance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] cut the gentleman from Ohio off. His amendment is eminently a fitting part of this program, and if he will ask unanimous consent that his amendment be considered at this time, if there is no objection, it can then be passed.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact, I agree with the gentleman from South Dakota about the fairness of this proposition, but the State Department, it should be recorded here, has never refused to give information to Members of Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad to have that information, but I think it should be a part of the law of the land that the Congress of the United States be entitled to receive this material upon request.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we return to section 501 so that I may offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I had had an amendment prepared for page 11, line 24, covering almost the same thing. I am a member of the committee, and I was going to submit it here for the committee to see. It would provide proper channels for giving to the Congress, that is, the House of Representatives and the Senate, this information. I will give the amendment to the gentleman if he wants to look at it. It would provide that the material disseminated shall be made available by the Secretary of State to the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee and their duly authorized designees at least 24 hours prior to the issuance thereof, and so forth.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That does not take care of the average Member of the

House. I might possibly want to see some of these broadcasts myself.

Mr. FULTON. But they would be on record here and the State Department would not have to give so many out.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: After the words "United States", add a comma and the following: "and to the Members of the Congress of the United States upon their request."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that this does not require the State Department to send every Member of Congress a bale of material, but they shall be, by law, required to furnish copy to any Member of Congress who requests it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I am worried about this amendment. The State Department has never refused to give me any information, although the Army has.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps if there had been such a section of law which required the Army to furnish the information upon request the gentleman would have received that information. We may not always have the same officials in the State Department. So it is well to write this requirement into the law.

Mr. OWENS. If they put that into the bill at this point, in another instance they will say they do not have to give it to us because there is no law covering it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not think so. They have already said that to you in the Army.

Mr. OWENS. I know. I am going to bring that up at a later time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 11, after line 24, insert the following title, and change the title numbers, section numbers, and cross-references in other titles of the bill accordingly:

"TITLE IX—ADVISORY COMMISSION TO FORMULATE POLICIES

"FORMULATION OF POLICIES

"SEC. 601. There is hereby created a United States Information and Educational Exchange Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission) to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commission shall formulate and present to the Secretary of State the policies to be followed and adhered to in connection

with the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills, the assignment of specialists, the preparation and dissemination of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, and the carrying out of the other provisions of this act.

"MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION; GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 602. (a) The Commission shall consist of 10 members, not more than six of whom shall be from any one political party, as follows: (1) Nine members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) the Secretary of State or such officer in the State Department as may be designated by such Secretary.

"(b) The members of the Commission shall represent the public interest, but of the persons appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, one shall be selected from among educators, one from among individuals formerly in active service in the armed forces of the United States, one from representatives of labor, one from the newspaper business, one from the motion-picture industry, one from the radio industry, and three from persons having general business experience. All persons so appointed shall be persons of national reputations in their respective fields. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) The term of each member appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on the Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of 1 year, three at the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

"(d) The President shall designate a chairman and a vice chairman from among members of the Commission.

"(e) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commission away from their places of residences.

"(f) The Commission is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this title.

"(g) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerical assistants as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

"SEC. 603. The Commission shall meet not less frequently than once each month and shall from time to time prepare and transmit to the Secretary and to the Congress its recommendations for carrying out the various activities authorized by this act, and shall submit to the Congress a quarterly report of all programs and activities recommended by it under this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman—
Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I asked the gentleman to yield in the interest of saving time.

I might advise the House that the gentleman from Illinois with a great deal of

forethought brought this matter before our committee. We held at least two sessions on it. We worked with him on every section of it, on every aspect of it, and the language was finally evolved in such form that it is now mutually acceptable both to Mr. DIRKSEN and our committee.

The committee is in complete agreement with the amendment he has offered. If, therefore, the gentleman so desired, he might extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point and we could adopt the amendment unanimously.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To that I have no objection.

Mr. Chairman, I belabored this matter earlier this afternoon endeavoring to set it up clearly in the hope that the apprehensions of the Members on this question might be mollified and there might be a semblance of control reposed in the Congress. That is so manifestly because this Commission is bipartisan in character and must be confirmed by the Senate. If it gets out of hand it is only because we fail to exercise our own responsibility in passing upon those who are members of the Commission.

I am grateful to the chairman of the committee for his indulgence in the matter and for his acceptance in the name of the committee of this amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin to the amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Strike out "10" and insert "11"; and after the word "labor" insert the words "one farmer."

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the reasons that I offer this amendment are as follows:

First. In the first place the farmer and the rural people of America and in fact in the world are the most peace-loving people to be found anywhere on the face of the earth.

Second. The rural people of America, though less than 25 percent of the people of our country, raise nearly 50 percent of the children of our country. The bill is offered as a peace-promoting agency of Government. Should not the rural people be represented on this board? I say yes, a thousand times yes.

Third. Rural America is called upon to produce the food and fiber in time of war. They are deserving of a place at the table of the group whose objective is to maintain peace.

Fourth. We already have the world Food and Agricultural Organization, known as FAO. Rural America is most assuredly entitled to a place on this board to be in contact with FAO and its activities. We have at this hour our own farm organizations, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers Union and the national cooperatives meeting with the world farm organizations.

Fifth. Many students from other lands have and no doubt will continue to attend agricultural colleges of our land in great numbers. The development of agriculture in many countries is going to be all-important, if certain sections of

the world are to feed themselves. Surely American farmers are entitled to this representation.

Sixth. I have been conservative in asking for only one farmer to be included. The history of the peaceful position of the farmers of the world would justify a greater representation. The farmer is close to nature and close to his Maker. If all the members of all of the boards of all the countries were farmers, a great step would be taken to prevent any future wars.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, I would have no objection to the amendment and I am reasonably confident the committee would not.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly the committee would have no objection. We are for the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely glad that this Commission is provided for and that there is to be a screening of the personnel. I remember that I started in the last session of Congress a rather bitter fight in the Foreign Affairs Committee in urging the adoption of provision for a Commission to screen the personnel to be employed by UNESCO. I remember at that time many considered it very important that voluntary organizations be given a chance to express their opinion on the personnel to be taken, such as recommendation for personnel from the Federation of Labor and under the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] one from Agriculture. While the Department fought that provision very bitterly at the time it is one of the things that the Secretary of State now boasts about. He boasts that the United States is the only country that has a screening commission on personnel. The American public wants to be informed on what is being done in appointments. They feel this screening does it. I rejoice that this committee has accepted this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Section 3 of Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, which shows the observation of UNESCO screening of personnel:

Sec. 3. In fulfillment of article VII of the constitution of the Organization, the Secretary of State shall cause to be organized a National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Corporation of not to exceed 100 members. Such Commission shall be appointed by the Secretary of State and shall consist of (a) not more than 60

representatives of principal national, voluntary organizations interested in educational, scientific, and cultural matters; and (b) not more than 40 outstanding persons selected by the Secretary of State, including not more than 10 persons holding office under or employed by the Government of the United States, not more than 15 representatives of the educational, scientific, and cultural interests of State and local governments, and not more than 15 persons chosen at large. The Secretary of State is authorized to name in the first instance 50 of the principal national voluntary organizations, each of which shall be invited to designate one representative for appointment to the National Commission. Thereafter, the National Commission shall periodically review and, if deemed advisable, revise the list of such organizations designating representatives in order to achieve a desirable rotation among organizations represented. To constitute the initial Commission, one-third of the members shall be appointed to serve for a term of 1 year, one-third for a term of 2 years, and one-third or the remainder thereof for a term of 3 years; from thence on following, all members shall be appointed for a term of 3 years each, but no member shall serve more than 2 consecutive terms. The National Commission shall meet at least once annually. The National Commission shall designate from among its members an executive committee, and may designate such other committees as may prove necessary, to consult with the Department of State and to perform such other functions as the National Commission shall delegate to them. No member of the National Commission shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services: *Provided, however*, That he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon authorized meetings or in consultation on request with the Department of State. The Department of State is authorized to provide the necessary secretariat for the Commission.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call the attention of Congress to what will be virtually a lock-out in the shipping industry. It will take place at midnight tomorrow.

I wish to give the Congress the facts. These facts are very revealing as a preview of the effect of the Hartley-Taft bill on industrial relations in the United States. Labor organizations have been meeting with representatives of the shipowners. The representatives of the shipowners have throughout these meetings taken an intransigent position. The labor organizations on the west coast have made a very simple and what must be considered by everyone as a very fair proposal. They have asked that the existing contracts be continued. Representatives of labor on the east coast have asked for a discussion of wage rates. The shipowners have refused to accept the proposal to continue existing contracts on the west coast and, as far as the east-coast shipowners are concerned, this afternoon they notified the representatives of labor that the only proposals they will consider are wage cuts.

It is significant that Mr. Frank J. Taylor, chairman of the Merchant

Marine Institute, throughout the discussions informed representatives of organized labor that he and his associates were depending on the inevitable operations of the Taft-Hartley bill. They have broken off the meetings, they have left the conference. Labor organizations have sent a telegram to Secretary Schwellenbach asking him to intercede so as to prevent this lockout in the shipping industry of the United States.

The question that may be raised in your mind is: Well, perhaps these shipping companies cannot afford to continue existing contracts; perhaps they are justified in demanding wage cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me excerpts from the testimony of Under Secretary Will Clayton before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of February 7, 1947. In discussing the profits of the shipping companies, I read the following excerpts.

Page 200:

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the profits are in the shipping business. I think they are much too large. I would like to say that I think they act as a restraint and a limitation, a limiting factor on world trade. I think if we had more of these ships out of the rivers and harbors where they have been laid up we would have a little more competition, perhaps, in the shipping business and we would get these rates down somewhat to the advantage of this country and every other country, particularly the countries of Europe that are struggling to reconstruct and get back on their feet again. I think shipping rates are much too high.

Mr. WEICHEL. Do you think the American merchant marine should have more competition?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think we should have, if we have rates too high, and I state it as my considered opinion, and I have been in this game for 40 years, I state it as my considered opinion that rates are much too high now.

Mr. WEICHEL. You mean world rates or American rates?

Mr. CLAYTON. World rates, and American rates are part of world rates. If we had more of these ships broken out of the rivers and harbors where they have been laid up and put into service, I think we would get rates down to where they would be reasonable.

Page 241:

Mr. CLAYTON. I am speaking, Mr. Bradley, as to the competitive aspects of this matter and the influence it may have on the profits of the shipping companies. I tell you they are making plenty of money and they are not complaining on that score. They would be laughed out of court if they should. If they brought in their balance sheets along with their complaint they would be laughed right out of court.

Mr. CLAYTON. No, sir. But I do think companies making enormous profits, unheard of profits in peacetime, absolutely unheard of, that anybody making profits on that scale should have a right to come in and complain about competition.

Mr. Chairman, when we charged that this legislation was going to bring about intransigence on the part of industry, wage cuts, complete disruption of peaceful industrial relations and negation of collective bargaining, we were correct. The events of today and tomorrow are supporting that contention.

This lock-out in our merchant marine, the operation of which is so essential in the program of world reconstruction, is being brought about by the shipowners

who have placed their feet on the table and who are relying on the Taft-Hartley bill not only to destroy organizations of labor but to destroy the wage standards that labor has acquired. Not only do they refuse to negotiate, mediate, or arbitrate revision of wage standards upward, but they refuse and continue present wages and demand that wages be cut. They refuse to continue existing contracts, they demand that wages be cut, they walk out of negotiations, walk out of conferences, and rely on the Taft-Hartley bill.

What is happening in this industry will happen in the next few weeks in many other industries in these United States. This lock-out in the shipping industry is a preview of labor relations under the Taft-Hartley law. It is the pattern that the monopolies will follow.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "farmer" in my amendment be changed to read "one farmer."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

**TITLE VI—APPROPRIATIONS
GENERAL AUTHORIZATION**

Sec. 601. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized.

TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

Sec. 602. The Secretary may authorize the transfer to other Government agencies for expenditure in the United States and in other countries, in order to carry out the purposes of this act, any part of any appropriations available to the Department for carrying out the purposes of this act, for direct expenditure or as a working fund, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained in this act or under the authority governing the activities of the Government agency to which a part of any such appropriation is transferred, provided the activities come within the scope of this act.

**TITLE VII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES
THE SECRETARY**

Sec. 701. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) In carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries;

(2) to furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries;

(3) in carrying out title V of this act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States for periods not to exceed 10 years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation act;

(4) to furnish official entertainment when provided for by the appropriation act;

(5) to establish and maintain in the United States reception centers for foreign students and for visitors representative of the fields listed in section 201 above;

(6) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United

States, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);

(7) to employ, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation act, (1) persons on a temporary basis, and (2) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available; and

(8) to create such advisory committee as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act. No committee member shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services; but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 13, line 9, after "(3)", insert "when necessary."

Page 13, line 16, after the word "entertainment" strike out the balance of the line and all of line 17, and insert "necessary for the purposes of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MASON: Strike out all of title VII.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I offered a very drastic amendment to strike the enacting clause. I knew it was a drastic amendment. I did not offer it as dilatory tactics but I did offer it to test the sentiment of the committee, and I succeeded in doing it. I cited as a basis for offering that amendment some foolish provisions that I consider were in the bill, and I read them.

I am offering this amendment to strike title VII, and I want to read part of the bill as a basis for the reason for offering this amendment, and I want to perhaps carry on from where the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gwynne] left off when he was discussing the educational provisions in this bill and when he stated definitely that they were contrary to the educational policies of this Nation as we have known them in the past. I also say they are absolutely in violation of the educational policies of the United States since we have known them, over 150 years. As a basis for my opinion, I read the exact wording in title VII, section 701:

In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries.

In other words, this is a blanket authorization of funds in any amount, in the billions of dollars, that the Congress might appropriate, a blanket authorization to grant Federal aid to States, to local communities, and to individuals in the United States, and to States and private individuals in foreign countries.

During the past few days many of the provisions carried in this bill have been presented to us. If we do not know by this time that this bill should be recommended, then I say we are impossible in our attitude toward it. I warn you now that no matter how much is accepted by this committee and how many amendments and changes are made in order to get the bill passed by the House, that does not mean those will be the final provisions of this bill and we all know it. It will give authority to another body to place back in the Appropriations Committee the amount that we struck out on a point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the gentleman from Illinois has moved to strike out all of title VII. He has placed special emphasis upon the language beginning at the bottom of page 12 and running over to line 4 on page 13, which is the first paragraph of section 701. Had his amendment been confined to that particular paragraph, I think it might well have been worthy of debate, but his amendment actually strikes out the entire title.

If that should prevail, it will mean the end of the broadcasting effort completely, for on page 13, commencing at line 9, we find language which authorizes the purchase, rental, construction, including maintenance and operation of facilities for radio transmission.

The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike that out completely and make our Government withdraw from that field altogether so as to make the American people say in effect, "We quit."

I am not sure that the gentleman intends to do that but that is the effect of his amendment. On many an occasion during this debate I have heard Members say that if this bill is confined more especially to the broadcasting feature they would be glad to give it more enthusiastic support. Here is their opportunity to decide whether or not they want to broadcast, because the gentleman from Illinois is offering an amendment to strike it out completely.

Moreover, under this paragraph on page 13, commencing at line 5, we find the language authorizing the furnishing, selling, or renting, by contract or otherwise, educational and informational materials and equipment for dissemination.

As I gather it, that would prevent the State Department from distributing the educational material in that paper, "America," in Moscow.

It would prevent the Department of State from maintaining the libraries, of which there are 170 now in existence. It may be stated that these libraries are managed, generally speaking, and are under the control of the American Ambassador or under the American consulate office in or near the cities in which the libraries are established and maintained.

In these libraries we find copies of American magazines and a number of American books largely of a technical or engineering character. All the evidence shows that foreigners flock into them to read not only the magazines, if they can read the English language, but to

get hold of the technical books and learn more about American progress in engineering and scientific achievement. Incidentally, that is good business for the United States because when knowledge of that kind is distributed to a foreign country it makes a market for our exports.

The gentleman from Illinois would strike all that out completely by his amendment to strike out all of title VII. In other words, his amendment means that there is nothing left to this bill worthy of the name.

It may not surprise members of this committee to know that I have been very heartily in favor of this kind of legislation for 2 years. I am in favor of it in view of what I see going on in the world today. I am in favor of it because I am convinced that it will help make America strong, and we need strength.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly obvious to me that the very thoughtful, sympathetic consideration of this legislation is going to reach a point after awhile, it now being 5 minutes to 5, when we are going to start rushing through the consideration of the balance of the bill. I hope you will not do that. There are some very important amendments that have been very well thought out and considered, which the committee will accept and which perhaps ought to be explained before we rush through this bill.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] just addressed the House with respect to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. In connection with his remarks he properly took the position he did with respect to the particular section to which he referred, but I confess I am very much in the dark. I have an amendment before me that I propose to offer to strike out sections 1, 4, and 5 of title 7. I would like to find out, if I can, as a matter of information, just what it is contemplated to do under section 1 of title 7. If I read it correctly, it means that you are authorizing the Secretary of State, within the limits of any appropriation that may be granted, to inaugurate a system of grants-in-aid; grants of money, services, or material to local governmental institutions.

What do you mean by "a governmental institution"? What is a governmental institution within the meaning of this language? What is a governmental institution in a foreign country? Is a parochial school or a privately supported institution of learning a governmental institution? Is an institution to which you may send these students, under the exchange programs, for training a gov-

ernmental institution? May I ask the chairman of the committee or some member of the committee just what you mean by that?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield. What are the governmental institutions that are expected to be aided under subparagraph 1?

Mr. MUNDT. Those which we have in mind and those which come under the program are such Government institutions as the Smithsonian Institution, such local governmental institutions as the University of Minnesota, perhaps, or the University of California, where, through contractual arrangements, they work out a program for the exchange of foreign students.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, do I understand the gentleman to say it means a college or school that is publicly supported? Is that a governmental institution?

Mr. MUNDT. That would be a local governmental institution.

Mr. KEEFE. Then you authorize them to make grants to individuals, public or private nonprofit organizations, both in the United States and in other countries. It seems to me clearly that is a very comprehensive and broad grant of power that has not been explained, and seems to open up the field to controversy and before you get through it seems to me you are going to get into uncharted seas.

Mr. MUNDT. With private institutions, you have the church school and the local private school in the same category as the State university. The whole thing is tied to title II.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand it refers to the student-exchange program. It would permit the endowment of a privately supported sectarian school, to which people would come from abroad. Is that true?

Mr. MUNDT. That is not correct, because it says "in connection with carrying out title II," which is another way of saying it covers the exchange of students.

Mr. KEEFE. But if you have a privately supported school, supported from private funds, it may be sectarian or nonsectarian in character, and you have an exchange of students for that school, that school would be entitled to receive aid under that section, would it not?

Mr. MUNDT. Not aid. It is a contractual arrangement with a scholarship which the State Department might extend to a South American student. He then selects his school. He might select Harvard University, for instance, which is a private school. We would not want to deny Harvard and Yale, for instance, participation in the program.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want to interfere with this program. I want to be helpful if I can understand it, and to be sure that we have got a program that will work and one that will not rise up to haunt us and torment us later on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 12, line 22, strike out subparagraphs 1, 4, and 5.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, may I say to my colleagues, does not in any sense curtail the activities that were suggested as necessary by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]; in fact, in his remarks he referred to these specific paragraphs as being open to discussion and debate perhaps.

I think we are getting into very dangerous waters when we attempt to invest in the State Department the right to make grants-in-aid for education in America or in foreign countries, and that is the reason I am taking the floor now, in order that when the question comes up for interpretation as to what the Congress meant when it passed such legislation as this there will be something in the Record to indicate at least the idea that the Congress had in mind when it passed this kind of legislation.

I believe it is dangerous to say to the State Department: "You shall have the right within the limit of appropriations granted to you for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title II"—which is the exchange of students provision of this bill—"to make grants of money to local institutions without regard and without investigation." I think you will be violating a constitutional provision and a policy of this Government that has been inherent in our Government since it was founded.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to comply with a request to divide his amendment? It strikes at three different points, three different matters. We do not have the objections to two that we have to No. 1, section 701, for example. It is in a different category. As I explained to the gentleman No. 1 involves the tuition of students at schools such as Harvard, Yale, and so forth.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wish to inquire if it is the purpose of the gentleman to try to defend that part of the gentleman's amendment which goes to sections 4 and 5?

Mr. MUNDT. No; I have no disposition to resist that if he will permit his amendment to be divided as to each of the three points involved.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand then, that the gentleman would have no objection if it were limited to sections 4 and 5? Is that right?

Mr. COX. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. I personally would have no serious objection to permitting language such as is contained in section 1 to remain in this bill with the thorough and distinct understanding that the Congress is not committing itself to any great big program of grants-in-aid, and that when the appropriation comes be-

fore this Congress, the Department is not going to insist that it was the intent that they should ask and put into an appropriation bill money to carry on a great big grant-in-aid program in education.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COX. The committee has no objection; in fact it has conceded the point the gentleman has been making, and in view of what is stated I wonder if the gentleman would not be willing to amend his amendment by confining it to sections 4 and 5?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee as made I ask unanimous consent to amend the proposed amendment by striking out subparagraph 1 and leaving subparagraphs 4 and 5 to be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman feel this money would go for instance to shoe industries, textile industries and so forth abroad, such as the Bata Co. that was in operation in Czechoslovakia and then during the war was operated in this country by a Czechoslovakian? It also had schools. Would that be considered in connection with these grants to other countries?

Mr. KEEFE. I may say I do not know and the hearings are almost barren on that subject. I would like to have some one on the committee answer that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. What is involved in grants of money and materials and services to institutions is illustrated by what we have been doing under this program in South America. There are in South America almost 300 American schools. The State Department puts up about \$182,000 a year to provide the salaries of about 70 Americans, as I recall, who teach in those schools. Many are the principals. The governments and the people of South America, including the patrons of the schools put in \$3,500,000 a year. They provide \$20 for our \$1 to maintain American schools which have great influence in developing the minds and molding the attitudes of the youngsters of South America into attitudes favorable to our country. That is the sort of thing authorized in subparagraph 1. I am glad the gentleman has agreed to its remaining in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my question has not been answered and I think it is very important.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we ought to have orderly procedure. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts can be taken off her feet by anyone demanding the regular order. I do not

intend to do so, but I think the gentlewoman should move to strike out the last word, so we will be going along in an orderly way.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be very glad to move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a unanimous-consent request pending. Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts object?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, to strike sections 4 and 5 on page 13 of the bill. That is as the gentleman requested his original amendment to be amended. The motion is to strike sections 4 and 5 on page 13 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment need not be a substitute. The gentleman may offer that as an amendment, if he wishes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentlewoman. Will not the gentlewoman from Massachusetts withdraw her objection and move to strike out the last word?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentlewoman, she withdraws her objection to the unanimous consent request made a moment ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin to modify his amendment?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the Chair there is no objection if I may have the opportunity to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman object, or does she not object?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to it, but I want my question answered first.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentlewoman will permit the request to be agreed to, she may then move to strike out the last word. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 13, strike out subparagraphs 4 and 5.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this very clear to the House. I think it is their impression that this money will only be given to educational institutions. I would like to state to them that in places like Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia there has been, in conjunction with industrial plants, educational teaching, especially communistic, and I want to make sure that it is the understanding of the com-

mittee that none of that money shall be sent to institutional shops or factories, like the Bata shoe factory in Czechoslovakia and other industrial factories. For instance, I understand today this system is being followed in countries dominated by the Communists.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to yield. I am sure it is the impression of the House that it cannot be done under this bill, but I want to make sure.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the gentlewoman is concerned, of course, because we do not want that to happen and I am sure that there is no danger of it under the provisions of this bill. In the first place, a very tight reciprocal clause has been written in on page 3 of the act, which provides that these interchanges of any type have to be on a reciprocal basis. As the gentlewoman knows, we are not going to have that with Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia and Russia.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that that still does not answer my question.

Mr. MUNDT. As to the other part of the question, the grants that the gentlewoman is talking about are exclusively for educational institutions, because they deal exclusively with title II. A library might not be considered an educational institution, but I suppose it is close enough to come under that heading.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I speak with knowledge of that, because I suppose I was largely responsible for closing the nearby Maryland establishment which was operated by the Bata Shoe Co. While it was supposed to be a shoe factory, in effect they were taking children into slavery. It was dominated by Nazi influence.

Mr. MUNDT. There is a reciprocal safeguard against that, because we have safeguards in this program so that it will not happen.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question in connection with the matter he had attempted to answer. What assurances or specific safeguards are there in the bill to guarantee that educational institutions for training in trades, such as we have established in this country, and that are entitled to the GI bill of rights, and that are so recognized by a government in Europe, cannot receive grants under this bill? There is no such language in the bill that I can find that does that.

Mr. MUNDT. There are some contingencies that we did not provide against, but we have provided for a control board, and we can repeal, by concurrent resolution, any section of the bill in toto. Now, we have additional control under the Dirksen amendment which, I think, is an additional safeguard, and it can be made to operate unless the whole world goes cockeyed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But if such an institution for training men in precision

machinery and other things is recognized as an educational institution in Europe or Asia, then they would come under the terms of this bill, as I read it.

Mr. MUNDT. Not under any mandatory provision.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion has not been submitted in writing.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, a preferential motion of this character does not have to be submitted in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and Mr. ANGELL demanded a division.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were—ayes 93, noes 95.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MUNDT and Mr. REED of New York.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 110.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that before the motion was made that the Committee do now rise the question was being taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. There was a voice vote and then a division was requested.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Chair had stated that a standing vote had been requested, but I think the Chair failed to state that the Chair announced the "ayes" had it on the voice vote.

The CHAIRMAN. No. No announcement was made on the division. The preferential motion intervened.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 145, noes 1.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 12, line 22, strike out all of subsection 1.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been fully debated for 3 or 4 days. This has to do with subsection 1 on page 12. It strikes out the authority granted to the Secretary of State to make these various

contributions. I think it is the most vicious part of this bill. I think it would be a dangerous precedent for this House to establish.

Without taking any more time of the Committee, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. In what particular respect is the subsection vicious?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I said I think it would be a dangerous precedent for the Congress to establish. It would give the Secretary of State a blank check to make contributions to governmental agencies, to private and public schools and universities, not only in this country but in foreign countries; and to individuals.

Mr. WELCH. Has not a precedent been established?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It occurs to me this proposed grant is without precedent.

Mr. WELCH. Of course it is not establishing precedent. Under the GI bill of rights a veteran can choose any institution of learning or vocational-training school, public or private, in the United States. That is his privilege. The amendment would deny that which is already granted in the bill of rights.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do you mean to the servicemen? To the veterans?

Mr. WELCH. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Why, it has nothing whatsoever to do with the GI bill of rights, except that its enactment could hardly be pleasing to our deserving veterans receiving educational benefits under that measure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the paragraph expressly says it is limited to title II, which has not anything to do with veterans.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is perfectly true.

But as I was about to remark when the gentleman from California intervened, this grant of authority to the Secretary of State can hardly be justified to our American veterans who are trying, with Government assistance, to complete educations which were interrupted by military service. We offer them \$65 per month single, or \$90 per month if they are married and struggling to hold families together. Yet here it is proposed to authorize payment of expenses of about \$10 per day for foreign students.

I urge that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were to be adopted it would be almost equivalent to striking title 2 from the bill because, of course, if the Secretary of State is not permitted to make the necessary grants to institutions to enable them to train the students and professors to be sent to them, or to give books and money for travel and maintenance to the individuals to enable them to carry out their

studies, then I do not see how he could properly administer title 2 of the bill.

With respect to the statement just made by the gentleman from Indiana that this would interfere with the GI's education, may I say that not a single undergraduate student will come to this country to study under this bill; only graduate students, and our graduate schools are not overcrowded, with the exception of a few like medical schools.

With respect to the question the gentleman raised as to the \$10 a day per diem for subsistence, that is a maximum figure and applies only during the time of traveling. Under the regulations of the State Department published in the Federal Register of August 23, 1944, the highest ranking visitors, professors, persons of influence or possessing special qualifications in a technical, professional or other specialized field, are allowed an expense account of \$10 a day when traveling. Students under the regulations receive not to exceed \$7 a day for food, lodging, and incidentals, while they are traveling to and from America except that it is \$3.50 a day while they are on shipboard. We can best judge the future of this program by what has happened in the past. We have gone over the figures of how it has been operated heretofore, and the amounts spent have not been excessive.

If you want to weaken title 2 and make the program of student exchange more difficult to administer, which program in my judgment is one of the most important in the whole bill, and in the long run, more valuable even than the information service, then you will accept this amendment.

If the subsection in question were to permit the Federal Government to make grants-in-aid to private institutions or to governmental institutions in the manner feared by some who have expressed themselves on the floor, I would oppose it. My votes have shown I am as vigorously opposed to Federal subsidy or control of our educational institutions as any man can be. All the subsection does with respect to educational and training institutions is to authorize that tuition and related fees when not available from other sources will be paid by the State Department "on behalf of the grantee direct to the institution concerned upon presentation of an itemized voucher countersigned by the grantee." Those are the words of the regulations.

This question of student interchange has already been discussed at great length and it has been approved by a majority of the Committee on several votes. It is my hope that this amendment, too, will be voted down.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. All I wish to say is that this particular subsection does not create a precedent but is already in force with Latin-American countries.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, all that this section does is to permit the Secretary to do in the new areas of Europe, Asia, and Africa what he has been doing all along under existing law with respect to Latin America.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Then if the gentleman's statement he just made to this Committee is true, they do not need this section in the bill. The gentleman says they have been doing it. All right; let them do it the way they have been doing it before without giving them specific blanket authority.

Mr. JUDD. The answer to the gentleman is that they are doing it now with respect to Latin America because they have legislation for Latin America. They do not have it for the rest of the world; this section is for the very purpose of giving it to them, otherwise the Appropriations Committee properly will provide no funds. The authority for Latin America was given in the legislation that set up the so-called Rockefeller program. This section does not expand the Secretary's power. It merely extends the area over which he will have such authority.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. Can the gentleman point out in the bill where there is any restriction on the \$10-a-day subsistence allowance?

Mr. JUDD. There is not anything in the bill.

Mr. MATHEWS. No.

Mr. JUDD. But here are the regulations that have been issued and from which I have read. As I say, you can only judge the program in the future by the way it has been handled in the past; and I can assure the gentleman that in the past the outside limit for students has been \$7 a day when they were traveling on land and \$3.50 when they were on shipboard.

Mr. MATHEWS. This is an entirely new bill, an entirely new piece of legislation.

Mr. JUDD. But it is the same sort of program for other countries that has long been provided by law and is already being carried out in the Western Hemisphere.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt; the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 106, noes 96.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. JUDD and Mr. HARNES of Indiana.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 106, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of making an announcement. It is a quarter to 6 now on Friday. We have had a long and hard day since 11 o'clock this morning. I want to say on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that I appreciate your patience and your diligence and your thoughtful attention to this measure. We have now gotten

down almost through title VII and all the vital decisions on this legislation have been made affirmatively. We appreciate that. We thank the House for its cooperation and support.

I see no reason, therefore, why we should sit here and argue about the remaining sections, which are pretty much administrative in detail, and which are largely in the nature of correcting safeguard amendments and directives. I think it would be more agreeable to the House to rise at this time and take our final action on this legislation the first part of next week, since it might require from 60 to 90 minutes at this late hour to wind up the details remaining to be considered and to explain fully the administrative safeguards they include. There also remain a number of amendments to which the committee has agreed, but each of them will require some time. Consequently, I move, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MICHENER] having assumed the Chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, had come to no resolution thereon.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 589), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RAYBURN reserved all points of order on the bill.

RENT CONTROL BILL

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 3203, relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce the program for next week.

On Monday we will call the Consent Calendar, and it is possible that there may be some motions to suspend the rules. Then we propose to take up the conference report on the so-called wool bill. I do not know how soon that might be concluded. The measure we have been considering today is unfinished business, of course, and if there is time it could be called up for further consideration at that time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I note that the conference report on the so-called rent-control bill will be ready on Monday. Does the gentleman believe that that might go over until Tuesday?

Mr. HALLECK. I have discussed that matter with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] and others. Instead of calling it up Monday, we propose to call it up on Tuesday.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is not absolutely certain yet that there will be suspensions on Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. It is not absolutely certain. Of course, that is within the discretion of the Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Would it not appear to the gentleman, then, that within a couple of hours on Monday we might get back to this bill? The Consent Calendar usually takes 30 or 40 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. That might be possible; yes.

On Tuesday we will call the Private Calendar and begin the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill. On Wednesday and Thursday we will continue with the independent offices appropriation bill, if that is not concluded earlier.

We also have for consideration, and hope to dispose of during the week, the bill (H. R. 1389) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act, and another measure to amend the Veterans' Preference Act (H. R. 9666); also the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act.

We hope that on Friday we shall be able to take up and dispose of the legislative appropriation bill.

Conference reports and urgent rules may be called up at any time.

If a veto message comes to the House on Monday, in all probability the vote on that bill will be had on Tuesday.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is it the gentleman's thought to schedule the housing bill, H.

R. 3492, which we were discussing yesterday and which has not been completed, at some convenient time next week?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; that, of course, is also unfinished business of the House, and that will be called up at any time when it is possible to dispose of it.

I might suggest to the membership that there is considerable work to be done before we conclude this session of Congress, a session of Congress which we hope to conclude before too late in the summer.

Of course, the membership has been working diligently and conscientiously and consistently in taking care of the business that has been coming before us.

As to the programs to be announced from now on until the end of the session, I think it might be well to say that the membership generally might be holding themselves in readiness to meet such requirements of the program as may arise in order that the work of this session of the Congress may be concluded.

AMENDING INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 246, Rept. No. 590), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the proceedings of the National Board of Underwriters, including an address by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the General Assembly of Connecticut.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. BENNETT of Missouri) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article by

Andrew Bernhard, editor of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette entitled "Visitors to Moscow Stress Need of United States Information Program."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the RECORD, in one to include Congressmen's voting records, in the second to include an editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator, and in the third to include the second part of a speech he made last Monday before the National Federation of Catholic Students in New York City.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one instance a letter from the Commissioner of the HOLC and in the other a letter and petition from the city clerk of the city of Clairton.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. T. J. Woofert.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is faced with a very important problem of determining whether the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was established under date of January 22, 1932, should be continued. There are many who believe that curtailment of its powers is a desirable thing to do. There are many others who believe that this Corporation of the Government has proven to be a bulwark of economic defense in the most difficult period in our Nation's history. We of the Congress, realizing the difficult foreign and domestic situation confronting us, keenly appreciate the importance of maintaining domestic tranquillity in a fast-changing world.

The continued or increased employment of labor, the rehabilitation of our returned soldiers, the maintenance of an organization in the event of catastrophe, cyclone, fire, or flood, the making available to industry working capital when normal credit is denied, have a very great bearing upon not only this generation but the generations which will follow us.

Never before in the history of this Nation have we been called upon to plan more wisely, to seek truth more assiduously, or to prepare more fully for what may be the eventuality of tomorrow. It seems as if there is nothing certain on the domestic scene. Certainly there is

no permanency on the foreign scene. With the whole world in a state of flux, with the economic flosam and jetsam of two wars piled throughout the length and breadth of this Nation, with millions homeless, with impending strikes at home, with the veterans desperately seeking shelter for their growing families, we should pause to consider the elimination of an organization which for a period of 15 years has been rightfully called the "financial Red Cross of the depression."

There are many who would highlight the mistakes made by this organization. It is unfair to judge either organizations or men by weaknesses to which we are all prone. Organizations are composed of men and are only as strong as those who lead them. Our cities, our States, our Nation, and those of the whole world, are dependent upon human beings in administration, and, so long as we remain human, we will have cardinal virtues and serious weaknesses.

It is in the maintaining of balance between good and evil, personally or in an organization or nation, that we achieve progress. We do not condemn our friends merely for an occasional weakness. To do so is intolerant. Even you and I have our weaknesses, and I defy any man to indicate either the perfect product, the perfect human being, or the perfect state. Have we the right, therefore, to demand perfection when we cannot give it?

The elimination, therefore, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, admitting that certain weaknesses existed, in view of the marvelous record of achievement it has maintained, can render a very serious economic blow to this Nation at a time when we need this corporate body more than ever before in our economic history.

We know that this Nation is composed primarily of small-business enterprises. We see credit tightening now, with unemployment mounting, with confusion and frustration facing many business enterprises, and, yet, there are some who would summarily eliminate this organization which has had for its formal object the preservation of business enterprises in this country when credit was not available. Hundreds, aye, thousands of concerns played a very potent part in the winning of the war because the economic life blood—working capital, if you will—was made available to them in the depression years.

The banks of this Nation, some 15,000 strong, turned to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for counsel and advice. Preferred stock and debentures were issued so that they too could remain as an important part of the economic life of this country, to give stability to the communities that they serve, and to make credit continually available to those who needed it.

We are asked to determine whether this organization shall continue beyond June of this year, or whether the banks of this Nation shall carry on without regard to Federal aid of normal credit is denied.

We believe in private enterprise. We believe that this is the greatest nation on earth because of the system that has

been promulgated throughout the years whereby each individual is given an equal opportunity to work with his hands. To others is given the opportunity to guide and direct, and, in a business enterprise, the normal flow of capital makes labor and capital a working team for the common good. There is not a single man in this assembly that can tell with assurance what will happen 6 months or 2 years hence.

There is only one way to judge the future, and that is from the past and present. In the past we have seen repeated depressions following a cycle of war where millions of human beings were dependent upon public aid because positions were not available to them. There are many who believe that at the present time we are in the throes of a recession. Many believe that this recession will be corrected within a period of several months, while there are others who believe that the recession may well become a depression, depending upon the planning and thinking of our national leaders.

During the period of the war, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation carried a greater burden than would normally be asked of a peacetime organization. It did it willingly, faithfully, conscientiously, and more and more responsibility was placed in this organization because of its reputation for doing a job along a businesslike way for the common good. The Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, even the Congress have made mistakes. To be human is to err. It is unjust now to highlight weaknesses only and not give credit where credit is due to the over-all achievements of an organization which has helped this Nation weather a depression and is composed now of experts obtained through 15 years of practical experience to withstand whatever economic blow may be facing the 142,000,000 people who comprise this Nation.

There is an erroneous concept that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has assisted big business. It has been their province to assist big business as well as little business because private enterprise, as we know it in this Nation, is not composed either of banks or business or agriculture or labor. It is the composite of these that makes our Nation great. While loans were made to railroads and banks and large business industries, the airplane industry and the automobile industry, nevertheless the majority of all of the loans made to assist private enterprise were made to small business. As a matter of fact, the record shows that over 90 percent in dollars and in loans made were extended to assist small business as we know it.

The economy of this Nation, supplemented and enforced as it is by big business, is mainly in the hands of the small business enterprise employing from 50 to 350 employees. There are over 3,000,000 small business enterprises in this Nation.

In those areas of the Nation which are composed primarily of small business enterprises—and New England falls into that category—we need the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for what it has done, because of the kind of organiza-

tion it is, and because we see in the horizon difficult years ahead. Economically, there is no stabilization abroad. Even now the Congress is asking for legislation intended to preserve our freedom through military education of youth because, forsooth, no man can tell what tomorrow will bring.

It is a paradox, therefore, to face an unknown future on a national plane where the best minds in America are concerned about peace and the generations to follow, and, at the same time, consider the elimination of an organization which is the only stabilizing force in Government today to assist the majority of our business enterprises when credit is not normally available.

There is a distinction between the credit made available by banks and that by the Federal Government in cooperation with the banks. There is a mistaken concept that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is in competition with banks. This is not so. Every time a loan is made some bank has denied the application or participates with this Corporation of the Government to extend credit so that that industry might live.

We have erected an economic clinic where ills of industry can be analyzed and a sound formula prescribed so long as there is an opportunity to preserve this industry for the common good. It is that kind of union between Government, banks, and industry for the benefit of labor, for the benefit of capital, for the benefit of this Nation, that we can preserve our ideals as a Nation and continue to operate as a private enterprise country.

Look around you. England, France, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Sweden, even many of our South American countries are turning away from the private enterprise system, and we, almost alone, are fighting the battle for a republican form of Government and the retention of our democratic way of life. The bulwark against recession and depression, for the preservation of the banks, industry, labor lies along the road traveled by this organization which has demonstrated, through capability and initiative, the confidence placed in this organization in 1932 under a Republican President, Herbert Hoover.

I will not bore you with statistics concerning the achievements of this organization. Much has been written and said in this regard; some good, some bad. In any event, we of the Congress must determine the issue—and remember, what we do will have a very important bearing upon the economic good or evil of the sections that we are fortunate to represent. We represent all of the people. We represent the banks, education, utilities, big business and little business, labor, all of our people. We represent the cotton grower and the farmer, the fellow who runs a haberdashery or a drug store. These are part of the industrial mosaic which makes America. Put them all together working as a team and you epitomize what our forefathers properly said in the preamble to our Constitution: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union."

I, for one, choose to champion the cause of the average citizen of America who has been and still is given the opportunity to establish his own business enterprise as distinguished from the caste system which remains in so many nations of this earth.

The solution of financial difficulties because of lack of capital, restoration of confidence, the offering of counsel and advice when it is needed most, have been the contribution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to our national well-being for a period of approximately 15 years. We can ill afford to ignore the fact that when the economic fabric of our Nation was torn apart, these Government representatives worked day and night to bring the seams together in order that others might have the opportunity guaranteed under our form of government. We will be asked within the next fortnight to make our decision on this important issue. Let us do it forthrightly by giving credit where credit is due. Let us keep faith with the future of America. Let us preserve our private-enterprise system, and let us give all an equal opportunity to be proud of their Government—the Government which we, the Congress, serve.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCONNELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Philadelphia evening paper.

Mr. FARRINGTON (at the request of Mr. MUNDT) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include certain telegrams in connection with the bill H. R. 3342.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

ANTICOMMUNISM POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have what is considered to be an anti-Communist policy all over the world. Recently we appropriated \$400,000,000 to help the Greeks and Turks stem the cause of communism. Today we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the Voice of America, to get behind the iron curtain. I think it is high time that we

find out in just what direction we are going. Are we adopting an anti-Communist policy or are we really only giving lip-service to the anti-Communist policy?

While we were adopting the Greek-Turkish loan there was a convention of 500 leading Communists in the United States, and incidentally they held their meetings on Federal Government property.

Next Monday, at the Water Gate, which is Federal Government property, under the Department of the Interior, the Southern Conference on Human Welfare, which is among the most pinko-red organizations in the United States of America, will have a conference or mass meeting which they are holding at that place. If we are going to spread the Voice of America throughout the world and adopt an anti-Communist policy, and send \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey to stop communism, it appears to me that we look stupid and silly all over the world when we are asking other people of the world to combat communism and then find that our Government officials permit the use of Federal buildings and Federal Government sites for the use of Communist organization meetings. Now, do we not look silly all over the world with that kind of a policy? I think it is high time for a show-down. For that reason, an organization, of which I am president, has issued a motion for a temporary restraining order against the use of that property. We have served the papers on Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, and he has acknowledged those papers. The case comes up in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. It is high time that we have a show-down. Is our Government truly anti-Communist or is it not? This case will bring the thing to a head.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therewith a copy of the motion for a restraining order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

JUNE 13, 1947.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AMERICAN ANTI-COMMUNIST ASSOCIATION, INC., 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE NW., WASHINGTON, D. C., v. JULIUS A. KRUG, SECRETARY, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON, D. C.

MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

1. The plaintiff is an educational, non-profit, nonsectarian, nonpartisan patriotic organization, incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia.

2. The defendant is an agency of the Executive branch of the Government of the United States of America, under whose control and jurisdiction is found a certain property known as and referred to as the Water Gate, Washington, D. C.

3. The defendant did grant a permit for the use of the said Water Gate to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as sponsors for an address by one Henry Agard Wallace on the 16th of June 1947. In the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, Union Calendar No. 660, House Report No. 2233, being a report of the Committee on Un-American

Activities pursuant to H. Res. No. 5, on page 28 is found a partial listing of Communist and Communist-front organizations, and among them is listed the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Henry Agard Wallace found it impossible to subordinate his political philosophies and beliefs to those of the administration of President Truman, and it was, therefore, necessary for the President of the United States to summarily discharge him or request his resignation. The said Wallace was during the first few months of this year invited to Paris by the Communists, and, while there, was the guest of leading Communists in Paris, indicating a strong sympathy with the cause of Communism.

4. The plaintiff respectfully requests this honorable court to take judicial notice of the opinion of former Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Charles Evans Hughes that "communism has as its objective the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence." And also, to take judicial notice of the executive directive issued by the President of the United States on or about March 23, 1947, requesting that all members of the Communist Party be removed from employment by the United States Government, which was a restatement of the law of the United States found in the Hatch Act, section 9A, paragraphs 1 and 2.

5. The defendant's outright and absolute disregard for the welfare of the people of the United States in granting a permit for the use of public property by a Communist group sponsoring a speaker whose methods incite human emotions toward riot and insurrection is a violation of the spirit, and intent of the laws of the United States and the said executive directive.

Whereupon plaintiff prays that a temporary restraining order issue from this honorable court to restrain the use of the said permit heretofore granted by defendant to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and that such restraining order run until the issues herein may be fully determined by this court.

FRANKLIN T. MILES,
Attorney for Plaintiff,
Washington, D. C.

PAUL V. ROGERS,
Attorney for Plaintiff,
Washington, D. C.

Service acknowledged this ----- day of -----, 1947, and consent to hearing on ----- day of -----, 1947, at 10 a. m., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AMERICAN ANTI-COMMUNIST ASSOCIATION, INC., 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE NW., WASHINGTON, D. C. vs. JULIUS A. KRUG, SECRETARY, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON, D. C.

TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion filed herein this 13th day of June 1947, it is by the court this ----- day of -----, 1947.

Adjudged, ordered, and decreed, that the defendant herein be restrained from permitting the use of Government-owned property under its control by persons or organizations in any way affiliated with or associated with the Communist Party, and more particularly that the defendant render null and void the permit heretofore issued to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare for use on June 16, 1947, of the property known as the Water Gate.

Justice.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WILLIAMS, for Monday and Tuesday, June 16 and 17, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document No. 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 16, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

785. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 19, 1946, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Red River, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex., and on a preliminary examination and survey of the Jefferson-Shreveport waterway, Texas and Louisiana (H. Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

786. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 7, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of a barge channel in the vicinity of Baton Rouge, La., extending from the Mississippi River through Devils Swamp, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

787. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report and findings on an investigation of the Cody Dam and power plant, Wyoming, together with related data and correspondence; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 72. A bill to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3539. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; with an amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 452. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders; with an amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3839. A bill making ap-

proportions for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 246. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2298, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 590). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3825. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3826. A bill to authorize and direct the Federal Power Commission to grant a license to the Savannah River Electric Co. to construct, own, operate, and maintain the powerhouse of the Clark Hill Reservoir project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 3827. A bill to establish a Weed Division in the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 3828. A bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting records of the Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3829. A bill relating to the employment by the United States of citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3830. A bill to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3831. A bill to incorporate United States Navy Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL (by request):

H. R. 3832. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LUSK:

H. R. 3833. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 3834. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 3835. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 3836. A bill to contribute to the effective maintenance of international peace and security pursuant to the objectives and principles of the United Nations, to provide for military cooperation of the American states in the light of their international

undertakings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 3837. A bill to extend the Federal income tax to the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3838. A bill to tax citizens of the United States employed by the United States in its possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3839. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 3840. A bill providing for the continuance of compensation or pension payments and a subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I or II during education or training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3841. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide full annuities for persons who complete 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEARHART (by request):

H. R. 3842. A bill to equalize Federal income, estate, and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to control the manufacture and sale of inflammable materials; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 3843. A bill for the relief of Rita Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3844. A bill for the relief of Anna Malone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3845. A bill for the relief of George J. Hiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 3846. A bill for the relief of the estate of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 3847. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Marincola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 3848. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3849. A bill for the relief of Domingo Gandarias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

632. Mr. CANNON presented a petition signed by 169 representative citizens of Albion, Nebr., protesting elimination of Federal cooperation in the farm conservation program, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We confess, our Father, that we know in our hearts how much we need Thee, yet our swelled heads and our stubborn wills keep us trying to do without Thee.

Forgive us for making so many mountains out of molehills and for exaggerating both our own importance and the problems that confront us.

Make us willing to let Thee show us what a difference Thou couldst make in our work, increasing our success and diminishing our failures. Give us the faith to believe that if we give Thee a hearing Thou wilt give us the answers we cannot find by ourselves.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, June 13, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 14, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 566. An act to amend sections 3533 and 3536 of the Revised Statutes with respect to deviations in standard of ingots and weight of silver coins;

S. 1073. An act to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served;

S. 1135. An act to extend for a year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; and

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate of Friday last, the